

P E R I O D I C A L R O O M
G E N E R A L L I B R A R Y
U N I V . O F M I C H .

Volume L

MAY, 1935

APR 19 1935

Number 5

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

KEMP MALONE

JOSÉ ROBLES

HAZELTON SPENCER

CONTENTS

	PAGE
TATLOCK, J. S. P.—The Date of the 'Troilus': and Minor Chauceriana,	277
WAGER, WILLIS J.—The So-Called Prologue to the 'Knight's Tale,'	296
ROSS, WOODBURN O.—Another Analogue to 'The Prioresses Tale,'	307
WEATHERLY, EDWARD H.—A Note on Chaucer's Pardoners Prologue,	310
COFFMAN, GEORGE R.—A Note on the Miller's Prologue,	311
PATCH, HOWARD R.—Precious Stones in 'The House of Fame,'	312
STEVENSON, HAZEL ALLISON.—A Possible Relation Between Chaucer's Long Lease and the Date of his Birth,	318
SHAVER, CHESTER L.—A Mediaeval French Analogue to the Dunnow Flitch,	322
PIKE, R. E.—A Sixteenth-Century Substitution in the 'Roman de Mandevie,'	325
PURCELL, J. M.—'Victorian' and 'Arride,'	328

REVIEWS:—

F. N. ROBINSON (ed.), The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. [M. B. Ruud.]	329
B. J. WHITING, Chaucer's Use of Proverbs. [Margaret Galway.]	332
J. W. SPARGO, Chaucer's Shipman's Tale. [M. B. Ruud.]	335
ISRAEL GOLLANCZ (ed.), Cleanliness, Glossary and Illustrative Texts. [R. J. Messner.]	336
G. R. OWST, Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. [B. J. Whiting.]	338
KASPER ROGGER, Vom Wesen des Lautwandels. [Leo Spiteer.]	341

BRIEF MENTION: Frederick Anderson, A Primer of Romance Philology,	342
---	-----

CORRESPONDENCE: The Date of <i>Ciperis de Vigneau</i> ; Reply; Rejoinder. Chateaubriand, Shaw, and Sannazaro,	343
---	-----

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,
Raymond D. Havens, Kemp Malone, H. Spencer, and J. Robles

ADVISORY EDITORS

G. Chinard, E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. B. Roulston

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

SUMMER SEMINAR IN ARABIC AND ISLAMIC STUDIES

June 20 to July 31, 1935

Sponsored by American Council of Learned Societies

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SUMMER SESSION

RUSSIAN LANGUAGE SECTION

For a period of ten weeks, from June 24th to August 30th, Columbia University will conduct intensive all-day instruction in the Russian language—one course for beginners, and one for persons with some knowledge of Russian.

SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF LITERARY HISTORY

will meet at Amsterdam from September 18th to 22nd, 1935. The subject to be discussed will be the periods of literary history since the Renaissance.

For information address Professor P. Van Tieghem, 9 rue Paul Saunière, Paris (XVI^e).

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103.
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.





Modern Language Notes

Volume L

MAY, 1935

Number 5

THE DATE OF THE *TROILUS*: AND MINOR CHAUCERIANA

I

The publication of Professor Robinson's edition, with its broad picture of contemporary views on Chaucer, offers a compelling opportunity for reconsidering a few of them. Like several recent writers, he accepts for the *Troilus* the date 1385-6. But to others¹ the arguments for any late date are far from convincing; none of them explains any difficulty, all merely undertake to recognize allusions. It is hard to see evidence even for 1381 (or soon after) in IV, 141-217, where there is no allusion² to the English popular insurrection of June 1381, simply because (as Mr. E. D. Lyon points out to me) the outcry for the exchange of Antenor and Criseyde is merely in parliament. Though Boccaccio's account is much developed in Chaucer's, nevertheless, just as in the former the debate is among the *signori*, the *baron*, so in the latter it is in an English-seeming parliament, among its *lordes*, that Hector urges keeping her, and that against him

The noyse of peple up sterte thanne at ones,
As breme as blase of straw iset on fire. (183-4)

There is a world of difference even now between "people" and "the people." Some readers have been misled here because probably we should not, as Chaucer would, use *people* for a crowd of disorderly M. P.'s, but *people* does not always mean commonalty, rabble, today any more than in Chaucer; or more here than where in the *Legend* the dreamer witnesses the procession of Good Women, and (l. 309)

Abood to knownen what this peple mente.

¹ *Ecce tot annis—posui ori meo custodiam.*

² Professor Carleton Brown, *MLN.*, xxvi, 208-11.

In the *Troilus* there is no mob bawling outside the parliament-house, but an uproar within (which is not unheard-of in England). Needless also to remark that the causes of the disturbance are no more similar than its participants, details, or location; there is no similarity except the shouting. When these facts are recognized, penetrating as it has seemed, the supposed parallel vanishes.

More impressive, no more cogent to some, is Professor Lowes' argument for 1382 or later,³ which has found such favor. As in the last case, some see no difficulty to be explained, and see mere coincidence in an ingenious parallel where others have been disposed to see a double meaning. Criseyde stood matchless in beauty (I, 171-2),

Right as oure firste lettre is now an A.

Is A (even *an A*, with a word-play) for *Anna*, who married King Richard II in 1382, and is there an allusion to the frequent use of the royal initial (though by Mr. Lowes' showing mostly on the sovereigns' own clothes and utensils, and mostly long after this date)? It may be tempting to say yes, but on examination the feeling of compulsion breaks down at every point. "E. R." was not then on pillar-boxes. Why did Chaucer abandon Boccaccio's "elegant and graceful" comparison of his heroine to a rose among violets? Perhaps he found it, as Mr. Lowes did later (p. 291), "elegant but hackneyed." Why did he substitute the "prosaic, even banal" first-letter-A comparison? Dunbar, Henryson and a sixteenth century writer did not find the still less romantic "A per se" too banal a comparison for London, Criseyde and Jesus Christ; St. John the Divine did not find 'Εγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω banal.⁴ Before the days of print, the alphabet had beauty, and its chief associations were high and even sacred; the cross headed the "Christ-cross row," and every second written page was liturgical or religious. Probably Chaucer fancied an A beautified with blue and gilt. Reading-matter did not blow about streets and soak in puddles. Was Chaucer so zealous for the A that he used Criseyda

³ *PMLA.*, xxiii, 285-306.

⁴ *Rev.*, I, 8, xxii, 6, xxii, 13; the passage is written "Ego sum α et ω" in every copy of the Vulgate which I can lay hand on, and medieval Latin poetry shows the Greek letters were sometimes pronounced here with their Latin names.—For Dunbar, etc., see *NED*. under *A*.

in rime to permit it? The indications are that he rather used the A to permit "Criseyda"; for emphasis perhaps at her first appearance in person, and perhaps he preferred this rithm.⁵ Varying forms of foreign names are common in Chaucer. As to other difficulties which have been descried in the line, it is true no one can prove it does not mean "Our first (English) letter is now (since 1382) an (individualized) A." But the *oure* is no likelier to show national loyalty than the universal human *oure* of "oure fre chois," or "let oure hedes nevere ake," or "the feend oure enemy."⁶ The pleonastic *now* is no more surprising than in

That wol I seyn, al were he now my brother.⁷

An A no more points to a human individual than Mr. Weller's "Put it down a we, My Lord, put it down a we." Chaucer is addicted to pleonastic words, far more than modern poets, who have preferred to gloss their little verse-problems with decorative epithets. All the arguments have now been regarded. For this interpretation of the line, we have our choice of accepting it because it is brilliant or having our doubts because it is needless.

The most imposing argument for a late date is Mr. Root's,—the fact that about 13 May, 1385, the moon, Jupiter and Saturn were in conjunction in Cancer, precisely as at the climax of Chaucer's poem;⁸ and above all the fact that the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Cancer had never occurred since 769 A. D., nor would recur before 1444. Since the moon would meet these slow planets once a month, and the platic conjunction lasted many weeks, the participation of the moon is insignificant for the date.⁹

⁵ While "Criseyde" is his usual form, he sometimes uses "Criséyda" to change and extend the rithm (II, 649, in Robinson and Skeat; II, 1424, in them and the Globe).

⁶ *TC* iv, 1059; *LGW* 705; *PardT* 844; dozens of other passages.

⁷ *LGW* 2392; there is no question of time here.

⁸ The bente moone with hire hornes pale,
 Saturne, and Jove, in Canero joyned were.

(III, 624-5; Root in *PMLA.*, XXXIX, 48-63). Chaucer says nothing of the date, but the new moon would be in Cancer only in late spring. It is not important to point out that conceivably, since this conjunction is among the most stormy of all, a poet well up in astrology, who wished to keep his characters housed, might have devised it *ex vacuo*.

⁹ One or two of Professor Root's remarks about the moon (p. 62, note 34) seem to invite reconsideration.

It is well also to observe that, as Mr. Root notes (pp. 56, 53), so far from taking over the whole planetary configuration in May of 1385, Chaucer omits the most showy part, the conjunction of Venus with Jupiter and Saturn at this same time, and in fact contradicts the visible situation by putting Venus in the morning sky a few hours later (ll. 1417-8). He gives no photograph, only a selective sketch. This accords with a spectacle not seen but imagined, in a passage with no difficulty demanding explanation. Yet I would not minimize Mr. Root's acute observation; the point is that this coincidence seems a little too surprising to be fortuitous.

But there seems every probability that such a rare and threatening event should be long foreseen and mentioned among the astrologically-minded; the comment on it afterwards which Mr. Root records (pp. 54, 61) would lead us to expect early anticipation. The *Franklin's Tale* and other poems show how well-informed Chaucer could be as to the niceties of astrology, and he himself, to judge from the *Astrolabe*, studied the heavens with astrolabe, Toledo tables and understanding, and assuredly knew others who did. The motions and periods of the planets were well known, and excited far more interest than now. Few of us today know their positions, or even recognize the planets when we see them, or (still less) foresee their positions, but when everyone believed they caused momentous events on earth, their movements were watched (much as Mr. Root says, pp. 61-2) with almost painful interest. Everyone familiar with medieval chroniclers knows this. Eclipses had been forecast since the Greeks and Babylonians, and as Mr. Root shows,¹⁰ it was easy to figure out past or future positions of the planets. Anyone could have done it, "litell Lowis my sone" could have done it. It is also a fact that the conjunctions and other aspects of the farther planets (Jupiter and Saturn being the farthest) were believed the most potent.¹¹ The supposition here made does no more than justice to the mental activity of early scientific men.

But we are not left to supposition; there is plenty of evidence that forecasts were actually made. So far as now known, the earliest eclipse foretold in England was that of the moon on the feast of the Circumcision, 1237, foretold by Master Walter le

¹⁰ Pp. 52, 60; Skeat, III, 226-7.

¹¹ See, e.g., Franz Boll, *Sternglaube u. Sterndeutung* (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 34, 111, 135; Root, p. 60.

Pruz.¹² Richard of Wallingford (d. 1336) wrote a treatise on eclipses, and John Ashenden, fellow of Merton in 1338, is said in a medieval account to have prognosticated the Black Death from an eclipse of the moon, and in 1345 to have foretold eclipses of the moon and the positions of the three farthest planets,¹³ which would be far easier to foretell than eclipses. These of course are mere casual specimens. To come nearer home, the Plimpton MS of Chaucer's *Astrolabe* (formerly Ashburnham App. cxxiii) contains information about six solar and six lunar eclipses between 1417 and 1433, which were probably at least in part computed in advance.¹⁴ More significant is the proof, pointed out to me by Mr. Thomas George, that not only movements of the planets but just such conjunctions as Chaucer's were anticipated. On the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn (evidently in Pisces) 28 Apl., 1583, no less than three small books were published¹⁵ some weeks and months ahead (two of them by brothers of Gabriel Harvey); the longest of them finished 6 Dec., 1582, nearly five months ahead, entered S. R. 22 Jan., 1583, and taken so seriously as to be replied to by the bishop of London, Thomas Nashe, and others. Pamphleteers did not vent their wares till the occasion approached, but astrologers knew what was coming long before, and presumably no more in the sixteenth century than in the fourteenth. Doubtless such cases could be multiplied. Does anyone suppose that before the invention of printing, and the spread of skepticism in the sixteenth century, interest in such things was at all less? For years before 1385 Jupiter (moving about 30° a year) would be seen gradually overhauling Saturn (moving about 12°), at the rate of 18° or about half a sign a year. Why limit the anticipation, as

¹² *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, XLIV, 96.

¹³ R. T. Gunther, *Early Science in Oxford* (Oxford, 1923), II, 50, 55.

¹⁴ The ground for this statement (*a priori* likely) is as follows. All (probably) of the solar eclipses visible in England between 6 April, 1418, and 17 June, 1433, are given, and all the lunar between 25 Oct., 1417, and 2 Aug., 1422. It is seen that the two sets of six begin within five and a half months of each other (none being omitted between), but end eleven years apart; probably the date of writing was not after but before,—mid or late 1417. It would be too complicated to consider here the data as to times and durations. I am much indebted to Mr. G. A. Plimpton, and greatly to Professor W. F. Meyer.

¹⁵ See *Works of Th. Nashe* (ed. R. B. McKerrow, London, 1904), I, 196, and especially V, 166-9.

Mr. Root does (p. 62), to two or three months? Even six or eight years earlier the two planets would be visible at the same time and far above the eastern and western horizons, and to the astrologic eye the momentous new conjunction would be equally visible. If a later one in this series was broadcast among the middle class some months before, should not the first of the series be foreseen by the expert some years before? The fact that the series had not occurred for six centuries, but hereafter for centuries would occur in wet signs at intervals of about twenty years,¹⁶ would be especially likely to excite interest long before. Someone's casual remark as to this prospect would be enough to set Chaucer off. The fact that he omits the most showy part of the conjunction harmonizes at least as well with scientific foresight as with ocular observation.

I add a similar matter, though by no means as tending greatly against Mr. Root's date. At the point later where the catastrophe of the poem begins to loom, Hector's plan for a fight is made when the sun is in the sign Leo (iv, 32); at some unknown point, for "the breast" of the sign Leo is probably meaningless, mere poetic embellishment; and the constellation is even more out of the question. Therefore the date may be at any time between about 12 July and 12 August. Probably in order to evade responsibility in case of a chronological hitch, the poet oddly disclaims knowledge of the exact interval between the planning and the fight (36), but presumably it would be only a very few days. Directly after this fight (evidently) comes a truce, then immediately Calchas' request for Criseyde, the Greek embassy to Troy for exchange of prisoners, and the meeting of the Trojan parliament.¹⁷ On one and the same day as this meeting come all the incidents down to the last night-meeting of the lovers,¹⁸ and the next day Criseyde leaves Troy (v, 14-5). According to all the well-designed appearances, it would be within a few days of Hector's plan for his fight; this is not in the least forcing the evidence. Mr. Root (p. 50) clearly shows how exactly Chaucer times events in the poem. He continues to keep good track of the moon's positions (iv, 1592; in v, 648-658, Troilus watches the waning moon late at night),¹⁹ and

¹⁶ Root, p. 51, who gives much astrology to be borne in mind though not repeated here.

¹⁷ IV, 57, 63-6, 140, 143.

¹⁸ IV, 211, 350, 806-12, 885, 888, 914, 1114, 1126.

¹⁹ Mr. Root's note in his edition on v, 648, might be questioned, in accordance with the invitation in his preface.

with all his absorption in human feeling and thinking, he had a constant eye also on times and seasons. It is just ten days later, we read,²⁰ that (v, 1016-20)

The brighte Venus folwede and ay taughte
The wey ther brode Phebus down alighte;
And Cynthea hire char-hors overraughte
To whirl out of the Leoun, if she mighte;
And Signifer his candels sheweth brighte.

Venus therefore is visible and is evening-star, the moon is about to leave Leo, it is fully night, and therefore Venus' distance from the sun is considerable. The sun is still in Leo and west of the moon, for the moon in Leo is new;²¹ this harmonizes fully with the estimate previously worked out that this night is not much more than ten days after the day we started with, when the sun was in Leo. On the face of it, this spectacle looks likely enough to have been just seen. Now Dr. E. C. Bower (my thanks to him), astronomer in the University of California, assures me that in the thirteen years between 1375 and 1387 (inclusive) these conditions were fulfilled only five times, in the years 1375 (the moon left Leo 29 July), 1377 (5 Aug.), 1380 (2 Aug.), 1383 (31 July), 1385 (6 Aug.).²² The main point is this. The conditions were not fulfilled in 1387, as we have seen; nor in 1386, for though the moon left Leo 28 July, Venus was too near the sun (5° - 10°) to be visible, especially after actual nightfall.²³ Therefore if Mr. Root is correct

²⁰ iv, 1320, 1328, 1592, 1595, etc., etc.; v, 842.

²¹ "Horned newe" (v, 650, 657); it is invisible, the sun being well on in the same sign.

²² Strictly speaking, probably some of even these possibilities should be dropped, since the moon may have left Leo before nightfall; but with the moon invisible, these estimates are likely to be as accurate as any made by Chaucer, and for other reasons it does not matter. The day he refers to cannot be much earlier than the above days, since the moon traverses a sign in about two days and a quarter. All the days of the month mentioned in this discussion are according to our Gregorian calendar, not to Chaucer's calendar, which of course was the Julian, and to fit which we must subtract nine days from the Gregorian date; but this fact is insignificant for us, since all are Gregorian, and especially since the poet here never names the month or the day. For the reckonings involved above, the chief help was found in P. V. Neugebauer, *Tafeln f. Sonne, Planeten u. Mond* (4000 B. C.-3000 A. D.), Leipzig, 1914.

²³ The same is the case with 1378.

in believing²⁴ that Chaucer wrote III, 624-628, in May, 1385, or a trifle earlier, and that the poem was finished "between the spring of 1385 and the summer of 1387,"—and if in v, 1016-20, he also portrays something he had just seen, he wrote most of the third book, the fourth, and most of the fifth, about 4000 lines or half this very finished poem, about a ninth of all his surviving poetry, in less than three months, or (to use Mr. Root's leeway of two or three months earlier) in less than five or six months.²⁵ I do not regard this reasoning as at all conclusive, simply because there is another explanation than recent observation for the insertion of the second passage. Hardly astrology, as in Mr. Root's case; for we do not know, among other things, in what part of Leo the sun is, or in what sign Venus is. I mean the extreme beauty of the imagery, and the grandeur of any broad picture of the heavenly bodies, and the fact that the medievals constantly thought of their positions. Celestial configurations were probably invented as well as observed by Chaucer; a fact sometimes minimized by modern students desirous of finding evidence as to the chronology of his writings. The configuration is not usually so rare as in Mr. Root's case. The present case either serves a warning on any modern astrologers, or else (may one say?) pretty nearly disproves Mr. Root's date.

The writing of about half the *Troilus* in less than three months, or than five or six, unlikely in any case, is in the highest degree unlikely in view of the circumstances of the poet's life at the time.²⁶ Hardly any part of his life is less inviting than 1385-6 to crowd with literary work. He was allowed the rare favor of a deputy at

²⁴ Pp. 55-6, 62.

²⁵ If anyone demands more leeway than this, he might as well grant several years.

²⁶ Professor Kittredge (*Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, p. 37) thinks even two years manifestly too short a time for writing the entire *Troilus*. The two years he discusses were years of routine work. It would be absurd to seek nicely calculated less and more in Chaucer's leisure for writing, but one further thing may be noted. The fact that during more than thirty years he both continued to produce with some steadiness highly original, finished and learned poetry, and yet simultaneously carried on a great variety of responsible and practical occupations, shows that these occupations were not steadily exacting or intense. It would be hard really to parallel such a career in the whole history of English poetry; it is a vast tribute to Chaucer's vitality and genius.

the custom-house from 17 February; he was appointed justice-of-the-peace for Kent, a really important and distinguished office, 12 October; he became knight of the shire for Kent in August, 1386, and his expenses for serving were paid 28 Nov., 1386; he had vacated his London house before 5 October of that year.²⁷ From all this the inevitable conclusion is drawn that by the middle of 1385 he was established in Kent; and that he was soon established socially as well as physically is to be presumed through his so soon receiving these two offices, known to be then considerable. Pulling up roots in one community yet probably maintaining some relations with it, and rapid putting down roots in another, hardly favor the lonely and intense preoccupation of a poet. Mr. Root judiciously declines to set a rate for Chaucer's literary production; anything is possible; but a poet who averaged about a thousand verses a year does not seem likely in these circumstances to have written the *Troilus* so fast, or in these two years (from early 1385 to the middle, or earlier, of 1387) to have written between five or six thousand and nine or ten thousand of his best.²⁸

As to an early date for the *Troilus*, Professor Kittredge's searching *Date of Chaucer's Troilus* would convince anybody that much that has been said for it must be abandoned; in particular, any entire conviction that Gower in 1377 must have alluded to the poem I would fain 'revoke in my retracciouns,' and I would modify other arguments.²⁹ But I would also revive from the obscurity of a foot-

²⁷ *Life-Records* (Ch. Soc.); J. R. Hulbert, *Chaucer's Official Life* (Menasha, 1912), p. 64; Manly, *New Light*, pp. 35-7; *Anglia*, XXXVII, 19.

²⁸ Depending on whether *Palamon-Knight's Tale* comes before or after *Troilus*, and the *Legends* before or after their prolog. The minimum is some 4800 lines of the *Troilus* and a considerable part of the *Legend*. Personally I should put the first-named, and not the legends, between their prolog and the *Troilus*.

²⁹ But I should like to recall E. K. Rand's acute hint in *Speculum*, I, 225. The mysterious Lollius (of whatever origin) figures repeatedly in *Troilus* as a 'lawful literary device' for securing respectable ancestry for the story. He appears also in the *House of Fame* (l. 1468) along with five renowned writers on the Trojans,—Homer, Dares, Dictys, Guido, and 'Englyssh Gaufride.' This last is usually taken for Geoffrey of Monmouth. I hate to think of his feelings at being called English, and even from Chaucer should expect 'Britoun Gaufride' (like 'Bret Glasurion' in the same hall of Fame, l. 1208). Further, Geoffrey of Monmouth is a far-fetched explanation; properly, he is not 'bisy for to bere up Troye' as the first four are, but merely pursues the later history of certain of the Trojans'

note³⁰ what is almost a proof that the *Palamon*, which we call the *Knight's Tale* (unless revised in the middle), was written after the *Troilus*. The name Dane (for Daphne) occurs but twice in Chaucer's works. In *TC* III, 726, the poet has "whan Dane hire-selven shette," for which nearly a quarter of the earliest texts read *Diane*, as one might expect of many scribes. Evidently annoyed by this error, in *Kn T* 2062-4 with grotesque candor the poet, mentioning Dane, breaks out, "I mene nat . . . Diane, But . . . Dane." This is much more surprising than the verse about the A.³¹ Naturally the *Dane* passage (which certainly cannot be proved a revision,—it is in harmony with the often light tone of the poem) where Chaucer takes his impatient precaution is the second. If the *Palamon* or *Knight's Tale* came between the *Troilus* and the *Legend*, the crowding of these few years becomes still harder to accept. There is also Miss Bressie's weighty, if not absolutely convincing, argument³² for 1384-5 as the date of Thomas Usk's *Testament of Love*, which quotes, names, and shows great intimacy with the *Troilus* (as well as the *House of Fame* and Chaucer's *Boethius*). Mr. Robinson (p. 922) suggests that Usk knew *Troilus* before it was finished. But the trouble is that Usk's most striking citation is from the revised version of *Troilus*³³ (as no editor notes); did then Chaucer communicate, to a man whom

descendants in the fourth generation. In 'Englyssh Gaufride' how about a homeward glance at Geoffrey Chaucer, if he had lately written *Troilus*? Evidently *Troilus* is not immediately before the *Legend* (1386) if it is found that other long poems intervened.

³⁰ Tatlock, *Scene of Fkl. T. Visited* (Ch. Soc.), p. 36.

³¹ There is no good parallel to it even where the Pardoner (l. 585) in his harangue to the ignorant says he means "nat Samuel, but Lamuel."

³² *MP.*, xxvi, 17-29.

³³ IV, 967-80, etc., 997-1001, etc. (for the proof that the passage appeared first, and latish, in the revision, see Root, *Tr. and Cr.*, pp. lxxif, 517; *Textual Trad. of Ch's. Tr.*, Ch. Soc., 1916, pp. 216-20); *Test. of Love*, III, iv, ll. 237-8 (relation of foreknowledge to free-will), 242-3 (to the future), 254, 259 (*Troilus* named), in Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, VII, 123, and mostly quoted in Tatlock, *Devel. and Chronol. of Ch's. Works*, pp. 20-1. It is perfectly true that the matter is in Boethius, who is much used by Usk, but the point is that he cites it from *Troilus*—"the noble philosophical poete in Englyssh . . . , in a tretis that he made of . . . Troilus, hath this mater touched. . . . In the boke of Troilus, the awnser to thy question mayst thou lerne." The matter is touched nowhere else in the *Troilus*. The reminiscence is certain.

there is no certainty that he knew and no probability that he was close to, a *revised* edition of book IV before he wrote book III? If Miss Bressie's date for the *Testament* is correct, the date 1385 for the *Troilus* seems impossible. Even if we accept the latest date for the *Testament*, 1387, the former seems again crowding things. It is quite true that the revision might have been done in a month or two, but, directly after completing and publishing so finished a poem as *Troilus*, the poet is not likely at once to have set about extensively and minutely revising it. This was my meaning earlier in saying that the revision "implies the passage of a number of years."

Nor are we compelled to see anything in the literary quality of the *Troilus* inconsistent with Chaucer at thirty-five or forty; especially at a time when people matured early,—when women were marriageable at twelve,³⁴ and males at fourteen or fifteen, and were campaigning or the like at a similar age or even as young as twelve.³⁵ Its source the *Filostrato* was written when Boccaccio was in the mid-twenties; in Latin symmetry superior, in compass, insight, depth, and power it is vastly inferior to the *Troilus*. But though this cannot be proved in brief, literary history is full of highly mature works comparable to *Troilus* written even today "nel mezzo del cammin." The difficulty for some doubtless lies not in Chaucer's early age but in a very early position among his works, a rapid growth from the light French manner to complex

³⁴ Cf. Kittredge, *Engl. Stud.*, XIII, 20; and Tatlock, *Devel. and Chronol.*, p. 154; G. G. Coulton, *Ch. and his Engl.*, p. 204. The daughter of Grisildis (not to mention the Wife of Bath) is marriageable at twelve (*CIT* 736); Goldeborw is to be married at twelve (*Havelok*, l. 192); Brunhild is twelve before she plights her troth (*Corp. Poet. Boreale*, I, 304); the Blessed Virgin was fourteen (*Cursor Mundi*, l. 20824), and Merlin's mother fifteen when they conceived (*Lawman's Hist. Brit.*, 15701); it is high time for a girl to marry at fifteen (*'Tis Merry When Gossips Meet*, Hunterian Club, no. 30, p. 29).

³⁵ Tatlock, *Devel. and Chronol.*, pp. 149-50; Michaud, *Biogr. Univers.* (Paris, 1811-), V, 280; J. H. Ramsay, *Angevin Emp.*, p. 344; Froissart (ed. K. de Lettenhove), IV, 377; Lawman, l. 19900; Wace's *Brut*, l. 9247; J. L. Weston, *Sir Percival*, I, 244; *Corp. Poet. Bor.*, I, 351, II, 94, 178, 189; Saxo Grammaticus (tr. and ed. O. Elton and F. Y. Powell), pp. xxv, 366; and abundantly in Scandinavian tradition (*Heimskringla*, *Grettissaga*, etc.). Some of this of course is historically unreliable, but it was acceptable to medievals, and is not the mere infant-prodigy exaggeration of the folk-tale.

reality. No doubt it is this feeling which *de facto* has disposed some moderns to look with kindly eye on dubious arguments and even wild surmise. If we expect to see a poet's development unrolled simply and plainly before us, there are several things to mitigate the difficulty (if such it is). We know some of Chaucer's works are lost, and some he may have suppressed. Poetic growth is a function less of ascertainable training and practise than of development of personality, which is untraceable. Worthy as the *Troilus* is of Chaucer's "best period," we do not know when this was; he may have had more than one best period. *A priori* views in history are notoriously hazardous. We need not hold with Mr. Robinson (p. 452) that the chronology of Chaucer's poems might almost be based on their varying degrees of complication, for this assuredly was not always determined by date; it is equally possible to hold that his manner and achievement varied rather with the character of his subject. Is not the *Legend* far simpler and less mature-seeming than *Troilus*? Mr. Robinson appears to think so;³⁶ and how about his opinion of *Phys T* (pp. 10, 832), and how about *Manc T*, which at the earliest is not very early, being in ten-syllable couplets? The fact is that the *Troilus*, while full of Chaucer's mature and characteristic traits, is quite different in kind from anything else he wrote; it does not stand in the course of his main line of growth; he had not struck his pace or found his bent; he never again essayed so lofty, ambitious and finished a work (unless to a degree in the *Man of Law's Tale*). This is undoubtedly why Sir Philip Sidney in the *Apology for Poetry* gives the *Troilus* high praise, and markedly ignores the rest of his works. Of this fundamental difference, unnoticed by some moderns, Sidney was acutely conscious, and so was Chaucer himself. As I see it, after his apprenticeship in the French medieval manner, Chaucer in the *Troilus* tried his genius in the Italian-Latin more elaborate and formal manner (though without entirely representing his own personality). He then felt a more informal way to be the way for him; he returned to it with a new critical freedom after his experience outside it. Freedom and expression of his own personality are the mark of the *House of Fame* and the *Legend*. All this is har-

³⁶ P. 566. He favors the view that the legends were written before the prologue, apparently even before the *Troilus* (pp. 449, 566, 953); but since they were written as amends for the latter, is it not odd that they should precede it?

monious with an early period for *Troilus*. I am arguing here for no special date, merely emphasizing doubt as to a late one. It is permitted to regard the date as still unsettled, and so it may remain unless someone finds an indubitable borrowing in the poem, or from it, from or in some nearly contemporary work of indubitable dating.

II

The Friar's Order. Chaucer does not make clear what order his Friar belongs to; and he gives divergent hints. It would be natural that the friar mocked by the Sumner in his tale should be of the same order as the latter's enemy the Friar with whom he is so grievously wroth; but this would seem not to be the case. The friar in the *Sumner's Tale* is probably a Carmelite. This order claimed as founder the prophet Elijah, and the notion that it was derived from a sort of monastic community supposed founded by him on Mount Carmel, still a *pia opinio*, was taken very seriously indeed in the middle ages. Even in the early sixteenth century John Bale called his book on the English Carmelites *Anglorum Heliades* (sons of Elijah). Now in the discourse of the Sumner's friar, Elijah appears twice, and his disciple Elisha once (almost the only times they appear in Chaucer's works), as precedents for friars' virtues; Elijah fasted and contemplated (ll. 1890-3; the Carmelites were and are known as an especially contemplative order), and (2116-8),

‘syn that Elye was, or Elise,
Han freres been, that fynde I of record,
In charitee, ythanked be our Lord! ’

With the strong rivalry among the orders, it seems unlikely that Chaucer would have thought of a member of another order as thus celebrating the earliest Carmelites.³⁷

³⁷ So also says Skeat, *Oxf. Chaucer*, v, 339. On the other hand, some details seem contradictory or otherwise vague and inaccurate. Jankin (though hardly an eminent authority: l. 2259) declares that a convent contains thirteen; I find such a regulation in no order, and among the Carmelites any figures discoverable contradict this (*Carmel: Its History, Spirit, and Saints*, by the Discalced Carmelites of Boston and Santa Clara, N. Y., 1927, pp. 196, 213; I owe thanks for the book to the Rev. Mother Augustine, prioress of the latter convent). Jankin had no better reason for his twelve than the twelve spokes of his cart-wheel. The noble usage he

The Friar among the pilgrims, on the other hand, according to such hints as there are, did not belong to this order. If he is a Franciscan there is a specially keen stroke of sarcasm in the fact that he knew purveyors of good cheer (*Prol.*, 242-7)

Bet than a lazarus or a beggestere;
 For unto swich a worthy man as he
 Acorded nat, as by his facultee,
 To have with sike lazars aqueyntaunce.
 It is nat honest, it may nat avaunce,
 For to deelen with no swich poraille,
 But al with riche and selleres of vitaille.

However much in course of time the orders approximated each other, the Franciscans were founded particularly to minister to the poor, and St. Francis laid the utmost stress on humility for his "Fratres Minores"; and as to lepers, his almost sensational tenderness and service to them is renowned, was urged by him on his friars, and is recorded at the beginning of his *Testamentum*, in the *Fiores*, the *Speculum Perfectionis*, and early and modern biographies, and was imitated by his early followers and by such early Franciscan "tertiaries" as St. Elizabeth of Hungary.³⁸ In so long

tells of for serving the worthiest first at table (2278-9) is common enough everywhere; except I am told among the Dominicans, owing to a tradition in the order. This friar's order issues letters of fraternity with seals to the laity in the world (ll. 2126-8); but Carmelite tertiaries were not established till 1476 (*Carmel*, p. 44); some sort of lay associates however may have been known before (p. 211). I find no parallel in any order, or anywhere (in spite of the commentators), for "Deus hic" (l. 1770) on entering a house; "Pax huic domui" is the regular liturgical phrase. But other phrases may have been used informally, as here. If more important matters were consistent, we might detect ironical Franciscan allusions in *Summ T.* In the Franciscan Rule (no. 3; St. Francis' *Opera Omnia*, Cologne, 1849, p. 76), merely in order not to cause trouble, a brother may eat what is set before him in another's house; as to food the Sumner's friar had his strong preferences, which he emphatically conveyed (1839-43). This friar's appropriation to his brethren (1919-26) of the beatitude "Beati pauperes spiritu," though fitting enough to any mendicant order, might be an echo of the saint's enlargement on it, for the edification of his followers, in the *Admonitio*, cap. 13 (*ib.*, pp. 29-30). But all these points are probably insignificant.

³⁸ *Fiores*, cap. 25; *Spec. Perf.*, capp. 44, 58; *Actus B. Franc. et Soc. Ejus* (ed. P. Sabatier, Paris, 1902), pp. 93-6; *Opera Omnia* (Cologne, 1849), p. 45. St. Louis, an admirer of the mendicant orders, also tended

and cleancut a passage as that quoted it is natural to detect a sarcastic comparison between the Friar and his "father" St. Francis. On the whole, if Chaucer had not yet forgotten the Franciscan friar whom the probable tradition says he beat up in Fleet St.,³⁹ he does not make his spiritual chastisement of these brethren at all unmistakable. Yet there is much more suggestion of a Franciscan than of a Carmelite.

The same uncertain conclusion is favored by the picture of the Friar of the pilgrimage by the very careful and intelligent artist who illustrated the Ellesmere MS a very few years after Chaucer's death. The character and colors of friars' habits were and are, it is true, not as invariable as some have thought; and so I am told by modern friars. But in this picture there is no suggestion of a Franciscan or Carmelite; the man wears shoes not sandals,⁴⁰ has no cord about his waist, and his frock is neither grey nor brown. Its clear black color, with several indications of white beneath, suggests rather a Dominican or Augustinian, but neither by any means perfectly. Similar solecisms are committed by the modern

lepers (Guill. de St. Pathus, *Vie de St. Louis*, "Coll. de Textes pour Servir . . .," xxvii, 108). An appealing work of charity and mortification, it was confined to no group.

³⁹ J. M. Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer* (N. Y., 1926), pp. 8 ff.; E. Rickert, in *Manly Anniversary Studies* (Chicago, 1923), pp. 20 ff. Franciscan houses were not enough more numerous than others in medieval England to establish any presumption for a Franciscan (Dugdale, *Monasticon* [1830], vi, iii, 1482 ff., additions by Caley, Ellis, etc., records them in some 66 places, Dominican in some 58, Carmelite in 40-50, Austin in over 40; Manly's figures in *Cant. T.*, p. 511, are not very different). The Friar's semi-cope suggests seemingly no order but the Carmelites, who have always worn over a brown frock a white mantle to the knee (whence the nickname White Friars), but a short cloak cannot be proved as never worn by others. (So *Carmel*, frontispiece and p. 25; and E. Markert, *Chaucers Canterbury-Pilger u. ihre Tracht*, Würzburg, 1911, p. 48, who suggests possibly also the Austins). While it was and still is customary for any friars to go about by twos till of ripe age (as the Sumner's friar does and says, ll. 1778, 1862), probably any friar could receive dispensation to go alone on a pilgrimage; but it has been doubted if a Franciscan would have been allowed such grandeur as to ride a horse. On the whole it is risky to apply the Rules or even custom to particular cases; dispensations, lax discipline and casual variation are too common.

⁴⁰ But sandals were not universal; in *Peres Plowman's Crede*, 299, an Austin friar mocks the Franciscans for wearing buckled shoes against their rule.

cartoonist in portraying the officiant (say) at a wedding. This artist, who throughout shows the accuracy with which he had read the *Prologue*, found no guidance in this case, and portrays here the genus, not a species.

Sound conclusions are that the Sumner's friar seems to be a Carmelite; that in describing the Friar on the pilgrimage Chaucer may have thought specially of the Franciscans; and that therefore, natural as we have seen it to be that the two should be of the same order, Chaucer made no attempt to show that they were, or plainly to label either. And there is no strong presumption that he would do so. Far be it to belittle Chaucer's reality and dramatic aptness; they can be readily seen on every second page, and have been brilliantly exhibited by modern scholars where the casual reader does not suspect them. But it seems better not to force things where the indications are adverse. A busy man of affairs composed the *Canterbury Tales* during the spare time of probably thirteen years and more,—the *Prologue* and the *Sumner's Tale* perhaps quite a number of years apart. We know that he did not invariably look back when he should, and seemingly revised the *Tales* but little. Further, in spite of the eminence of some, the friars loomed largest in the life of the humbler classes. While surely Chaucer must have known some of the differences among the orders, he may not have known every detail, any more than in 1918 we distinguished all military insignia, and his complete contempt for his friars allows us to suppose that he disregarded differences. He gives a composite picture. He had in mind the *genus Frater* rather than a species, or, as the Parson might say, the root rather than the branches. This clear case has been worth enlarging on because moderns are sometimes tempted to go too far in attributing realistic finish to his poems, and especially in treating him as if he were not

but a historian. A friar in life would have to belong to some order, but not a friar in the imagination. Sometimes Chaucer's imagination went to the limit, sometimes not.⁴¹

⁴¹ I am only sorry that I am forced to part company with Mr. Manly. In that book which has so illuminated Chaucer's backgrounds, and added so many strokes to his portrait, *Some New Light on Chaucer* (pp. 102-22), he has some things on this subject which are hard to accept and even at times to understand. The Sumner's friar he believes certainly a Franciscan (p. 118). After what has been said above, what evidence is there for this? Even if the Friar of the *Prologue* were certainly a Franciscan, there is none in the mere assumptions that the Friar's and Sumner's quarrel was

III

"Heeld the space" (*Prol.*, 176). In "heeld after the newe world the space" (said of the Monk) some editors' parenthetical adverbial *meanwhile*⁴² for the last phrase seems unparalleled, and clumsier than Skeat's *course*. In classical Latin *spatium* means course, race, race-course or track, and *spatiōr* means walk or go. In medieval Latin *spatium* and *spatiamentum* mean going about,

of long standing (pp. 102-3), and that they came from the same part of the country, and that the *Friar's Tale* is set in the north (p. 103), as the *Sumner's* of course is. On the contrary, it seems to be far away from the north country (ll. 1413-4, 1397, 1401); and I am surprised that Mr. Manly sees any northern dialect in the tale, since almost if not quite all the words he cites from it as northern (p. 106) are found in midland writers and sometimes elsewhere in Chaucer, as can easily be proved. I am quite mystified here, and at other things. There is no evidence that the Sumner is chastising the Franciscans in the fact that just as the Holderness convent of the Sumner's friar is building (ll. 1977, 2099-2106), so the only house of Franciscans in Holderness had been building—more than a generation earlier (pp. 104-5; see *Vict. Co. Hist.*, Yorks, III, 265). On the other hand, there were two Carmelite houses in Holderness in Chaucer's day or shortly before (at Kingston and Sutton, both close to Hull,—Dugdale, *Monast.*, VI, iii, 1581-2; see Manly, pp. 104, 119-20), besides at least three elsewhere in Yorkshire; I do not venture to say whether Chaucer was acquainted with any of them.

Nor can I imagine who has suggested that the Sumner's friar was of the Cistercian order (p. 104), who were not friars at all but reformed Benedictine monks; has someone been misled by the fact that they were called "gray monks," just as the Franciscans were the Gray Friars? All will remember the "friar of orders gray"; they are "fratres griseos" in a fourteenth-century English macaronic poem in the *Monumenta Franciscana* (Rolls Ser., p. 595). The Franciscans did not wear brown habitually till centuries later; so far as I find, the brown frock has been more characteristic of the Carmelites.

As to the Friar on the pilgrimage, no more do I know the reason why the fundamentally puzzling idea (p. 104, posteriorly) that "the scurrilous anecdote of the Summoner's prologue certainly proves" him "to have been a Franciscan," though Chaucer shows no *viscera misericordiae* for this order, nor would have minded rumpling their feelings. There is no increment of evidence here. I note finally that the well-favored parallel to this anecdote which has been told of the Cistercians (*MLN.*, XXIX, 143) has been told also of the Dominicans in their *Vitae Fratrum*, I, 5 (tr. and ed. F. Conway and B. Jarrett, London, 1924).

⁴² NED. gives only *mean space* as signifying meanwhile,—a very different thing. One may ask,—the space of what?

recreation, even in hunting,⁴³ some of this paralleled in French, Italian, even German. In *Troilus*, v, 1791, some of the best MSS have *space*, a reading adopted by Mr. Root, meaning pass along.⁴⁴ It seems best to suppose that *space* meaning course existed in Chaucer's day, but in any case in the polyglot middle ages usages passed readily from one language to another.

Undermeles (*WBT* 875). There is no reason to doubt that *undern*, *undermeel*, always in Chaucer mean the later morning, never afternoon.⁴⁵ *Undern* later came to mean afternoon, for in the leisurely clockless middle ages times of day were vague and varying; people got up very early, and, further, midday was not so marked a point as in our life. But in Chaucer *undern* seems always to mean about the time of tierce the breviary-office; almost without time-pieces, but rarely out of earshot of convent-bells, the medievals depended on them for the time of day. In the line "In undermeles and in morwenynges" (*WBT* 875) some have been misled by the last word, which does not mean mornings but very early mornings, the time when morn is arriving.⁴⁶ The chronology of the medieval day is an inviting subject to look into.

The Bishop's Hook (*Fri T* 1317). All readers do not get the sarcasm in the Friar's "er the bisshop caughte hem with his hook" (the laity, with the purpose of fleecing them). The crozier is a "pastoral" staff, like a shepherd's for drawing back the sheep from peril, as was well known. Skeat and Manly⁴⁷ aptly cite *Piers Plowman*, where the crozier "Is hoked on that one ende to halie men fro helle" (B, viii, 95), and it is the spike on the other end which is to strike down the wicked. In delivering to a new-made bishop "baculum pastoralis officii" the metropolitan warned him to be "sine ira," "misericordie reminiscens"; the pastoral symbolism is still clearer after Chaucer's day, in the earliest English pontifical, of 1549, where in delivering the crozier the archbishop

⁴³ Ducange; and see Regino of Prüm in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, SS, I, 600 (var.).

⁴⁴ A sense amply illustrated in the sixteenth century by *NED*. Many of the MSS by their alteration show that this sense in the *Prol.* passage, if unusual, was clear.

⁴⁵ As taken by some editors and by the *NED*. Manly and the *Globe* edition have it as above, though without explanation.

⁴⁶ Cf. also Root on the meaning of *by the morwe* (*MLN.*, XLIV, 496).

⁴⁷ *Cant. T.* (N. Y., 1928), p. 587.

says, "Be to the flocke of Christ a shepheheard, not a wolfe; feede them, deuoure them not." The idea had been familiar for centuries.⁴⁸

The Merchant's Tale for the Monk? The present writer once thought the *Merchant's Tale* first written for the Monk, but at the suasion of Professor Kittredge abandoned the idea, which has lately been revived. Ll. 1347, 1384 contain no evidence perceptible to some; in 1390 and 2055 *worldly* seems to mean not secular but merely living on earth, as usually in Chaucer; and 1251, 1322 (insipid in the mouth of a cleric, in so intense and subtle a tale) contain merely a covert sneer at the clergy as no chaster than the laity.⁴⁹ The frankness of the Merchant's prolog (1213-44, which was certainly written for him) is startling at first in the canny, reserved Merchant of the *Prologue*, but in neither his prolog nor his tale is it easy to see anything contradicting his character; this controlled savagery among strangers of a restrained personality when touched to the quick seems rather exquisitely life-like,—*in meditatione sua exarsit ignis, et locutus est in lingua sua.* Why should the easy-going Monk feel so intensely?⁵⁰ In any case, with a work composed as the *Tales* were, we cannot expect and certainly do not always get extreme nicety in fitting distant parts to each other, as has been shown many times.

The Horseman in the Hall (Sq T 80-1). A horseman riding into a large building was common enough on occasions in real life, at a time when floors were on the ground-level and cellars rare. The King's Champion, offering combat to the disloyal, was a feature of coronation-banquets, even including that of George IV in 1821, though never thereafter; on that occasion he rode into Westminster Hall (presumably down an inclined plane), and his horse, trained to back out before His Majesty, backed in, to the mirth of the spectators. Without pausing over this pretty con-

⁴⁸ *Patrologia Latina*, CLXXII, 610, CLXXVII, 354, CCXIII, 80.

⁴⁹ This is specially natural if *Mch T* was written as a retort to *ShipmT*, then meant for the Wife of Bath. The Merchant's chief foe was she, but flings at the incontinent monk in that tale would be natural to a teller who was bitterly running amuck at everybody. See *Anglia*, XXXVII, 94.

⁵⁰ Mr. Manly (pp. 635-6) thinks the Monk in his prolog sedate and bookish, and altogether different from him of the *General Prologue*; Mr. Robinson (p. 13) gives the essentials of a possibly more living picture. But assuredly neither view harmonizes with *Mch T*.

junction of the First Gentleman in Europe and Cambyuscan, I add that John Stow tells of a horsewoman riding in there in 1316, at Edward II's solemn Whitsun feast (like Cambyuscan's birthday feast), as well as of horsemen there at other times.⁵¹ All will remember the cavalcade of the Feast of Asses in medieval churches. At Warwick Castle is a hall into which it is said horsemen used to ride. At a local festival held to this day (1930 and 1931) at Arles, horsemen ride into the hall even of a modern hotel to collect money.

The Manciple's "My sone." The *my sone*⁵² which appears constantly in the Manciple's sage advice (ll. 318-9, 321-2, etc., etc.) is perhaps not especially due to Solomon's Proverbs (where the case is different), but to collections of gnomic sayings in various languages; who could so fittingly advise about the conduct of life as a parent to a child? This address appears many times in the *Disticha Catonis* (and versions in French and English), in Petrus Alphonsus, the *Proverbs of Alfred*, and other places.⁵³ The combination of the popular *my dame* (my mother, l. 317) and *my sone*, points to no specific source; one may guess that Chaucer had many collections in mind, including word-of-mouth lore among the people.

J. S. P. TATLOCK

University of California

THE SO-CALLED PROLOGUE TO THE KNIGHT'S TALE

We have Chaucer's word for it in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* (F 420) that he had already written a romance of "the love of Palamon and Arcite," and Professor Tatlock has demonstrated conclusively that this poem was substantially the

⁵¹ M. F. Johnston, *Coronation of a King* (London, 1902), pp. 8, 9 (with a picture), 141, and J. F. Round, *The King's Serjeants* (London, 1911), pp. 379, 387; and see the account of Westminster Hall in Stow's *London*. Here as in other cases (pp. 823, l. 80; 927, l. 548; 929, l. 976) Mr. Robinson seems to emphasize the poet's relation to literature where one might think also of contemporary life.

⁵² Robinson, pp. 872, 870; the last point in his admirable commentary to be remarked on.

⁵³ *Anglia*, VII; *Erlanger Beitr.*, II; EETS., OS, 117; etc., etc.

same as that which was afterwards included in the Canterbury collection as the *Knight's Tale*. But, as Professor Tatlock recognizes, "some slight changes must have been made in the course of fitting the story of *Palamon and Arcite* into its context in the Canterbury series.

A passage near the beginning, ll. 889-892, which allude to the pilgrims and the supper, must be new, and probably the whole paragraph 875-892. At the end there is nothing which must be new except the very last line, a benediction on the "fair company:" yet the ending is so brisk and succinct that it gives countenance to my belief that the poem was never finished in its original form and that the whole present ending was made for the *Canterbury Tales*. Elsewhere I find not the least indication of adaptation or alteration.¹

Professor Tatlock was here occupied primarily in refuting the theory of a lost stanzaic *Palamon and Arcite*, and left it undecided whether the inserted passage near the beginning of the *Knight's Tale* consisted of four or eighteen lines.

It is my purpose in the present paper by a detailed examination

¹ J. S. P. Tatlock, *Dev. and Chron. of Chaucer's Works*, Chaucer Soc. (1907), p. 66. So far as the conclusion of the poem is concerned, the assumption that Chaucer altered his earlier text was not perhaps strictly necessary, for the line "God save al this faire compaignye!" (A 3108) may not be a specific reference to the Canterbury pilgrims. Most medieval romances conclude with some formula of benediction, and even the use of the word *compaignye* does not assure us that the story was addressed to a company of pilgrims. Compare, for example, the conclusion of *Sir Amadace*:

Jhesu Criste in Trinite
Blesse and glade this cumpany
And ore us halde his hande.

It may also be remarked that the body of the Tale has not even been adapted to oral rendition. It is true that the words *tellen*, *tale*, and *seyen* occur frequently, but these are also used in *Troilus and Criseyde* and the *Romaunt of the Rose*, where there is no idea of a character narrating the poems. In fact, the one hint in the body of the Tale which suggests any particular mode of rendition is the line, "And of this storie list me nat to wryte" (A 1201). This seems to represent a clear oversight on Chaucer's part when he added the *Palamon* to the *Canterbury Tales*. But in all fairness to Chaucer it should be said that on one occasion he uses *writen* figuratively ("This white top writeth myne olde yeris" *Pro RvT* A 3869) and on another he employs it in the midst of a passage of purely framework material ("After the which this murye tale I write" *Pro Mel* B 2154). The latter instance seems to cast doubt upon the common notion that Chaucer always and consistently thought of himself as a dramatic artist.

of the text to point out some definite indications that the entire second paragraph of the Tale, consisting of lines 875-892, was added by Chaucer at the time he incorporated the *Palamon* in the Canterbury collection. The question has some chronological interest, for within this paragraph occurs a line which is supposed to introduce an allusion to the arrival of Anne of Bohemia in England, and accordingly is taken to fix the composition of the poem soon after December 1381. However, if this paragraph was a later addition, the reference would not date the composition of the *Palamon*, but merely its insertion into the Canterbury framework. Moreover, as I shall endeavor to show presently, the line in question really contains no contemporary allusion and therefore is without chronological significance.

We may conveniently begin our examination with the unmistakable reference to the pilgrims and the supper in lines 889-892:

I wol nat letten eek noon of this route;
 Lat every felawe telle his tale aboute
 And lat se now who shal the soper wynne
 And ther I lefte, I wol ayeyn bigynne.²

It is clear not only that these lines could not have stood in the earlier *Palamon*, but also that they mark the conclusion of the inserted passage inasmuch as at this point the thread of the narrative is again taken up.

Confirmatory evidence that the insertion ended at this point is afforded by thirteen MSS. Five of them expressly designate the thirty-four lines which extend to the end of this passage as a prologue of the Tale. At line 893, twelve MSS bear the rubric, "Heere bigynneth the Knyghtes tale" or "*incipit narracio*," and still another MS (Harley 1239) begins the text of the Tale at this point. In marking the beginning of the Tale at line 893 these thirteen scribes were obviously mistaken, for the preceding lines contain elements necessary to an understanding of the story. But they were evidently impressed by the decided break in the narrative which occurs at this point.

On the other hand, the four lines quoted above show no lack of

² In two MSS (Cardigan and Manchester) just these four lines are omitted. Both these MSS, however, range themselves definitely among the "edited" MSS of the *Canterbury Tales* and therefore cannot be appealed to as preserving an earlier textual tradition.

continuity with those which immediately precede. The Knight has stated that he will omit certain details because he has a long story to tell. This makes it natural for him to add that he does not wish to "let" the other members of the company by the length of his tale. Without these four lines, his complaint as to the length of his story and the weakness of the oxen in his plough sounds like that of a person who is thinking chiefly of the expenditure of energy which the telling of his long tale will cost him. His statement that he does not propose to be inconsiderate of his fellow-pilgrims is, therefore, the logical culmination of what has gone before. It is thus obvious that the inserted passage did not begin with the four lines cited above.

A significant indication of the point at which the inserted passage began is disclosed by the shift of tenses between lines 873 and 876. Down to line 874 the *Knight's Tale* employs a logical use of verbal forms—past for events of the narrative and present for the time of narrating them:

*Lete I this noble due to Atthenes ryde
And al his hoost in armes hym bisyde* (A 873-4).

But the text continues:

*And certes, if it nere too long to heere,
I wolde have toold you fully the manere* (A 875-876)

The perfective form, *I wolde have toold you*, in place of the logical *I wolde tellen you* suggests that Chaucer was here inserting a kind of post script to an already completed work. At the end of this "post script" occurs another shift of tenses, though in this case a shift from preterit to present:

*And ther I lefte, I wol ayeyn bigynne.
This duc, of whom I make mencioune* (A 892 f)

Here instead of *make* we should have expected the form *made*. This shift restores the logical use of tenses interrupted by the introduction of the *wolde have toold* construction. Concrete verbal evidence, therefore, points to the conclusion that the inserted passage consisted of lines 875-892.³

³ One might object perhaps that the perfective tense in line 876 indicates merely that these matters have been mentioned a few lines before, and that Chaucer is conceiving of time as passing while the Knight is telling his

If we remove these eighteen lines, we find that nothing necessary to the understanding of the story is omitted, but that on the contrary the narrative is rendered considerably more consecutive. The opening of the Tale might then be summarized as follows: "Once upon a time Theseus conquered the Amazons and brought their queen home with him as his wife. Thus I let⁴ this noble duke ride toward Athens in great state with all his armed host beside him. When this duke, of whom I am speaking, had come almost to Athens, he met with a strange disturbance amidst the general rejoicing—a group of noble ladies kneeling on the highway and making such moan as mortal man never heard before, etc." The original *Palamon* may well have begun in this fashion.

When Chaucer came to fit his earlier *Palamon* into the Canterbury collection as the *Knight's Tale* he contrived to introduce a reference to the Canterbury pilgrims, at the same time excusing himself for abridging the narrative by omitting details which stood in his sources. He also managed to illustrate the courtesy of the Knight, who here protests his unwillingness to disregard the rights of the other members of the company. Accordingly, Chaucer's eighteen-line insertion might be paraphrased as follows: "I would have gone into the opening events of my story fully if my Tale were not already too long as it is. I do not wish to interfere with the opportunity of the other members of the company

tale. But in that case why does the Knight say at line 893, "This duc, of whom I make menciouin," using the present rather than the perfect for something mentioned eighteen lines before?

⁴ It might be argued that "lete I this noble duc" would seem to imply a change of subject matter, such as that furnished by the eighteen-line paragraph, thus making the digression organic to the opening of the Tale. It is true that *leten* is often used in the sense of "leave" to introduce a change of subject matter. But quite as often it indicates mere passage of time without any such change, e.g.

And thus I lete hem ete and drynke and pleye,
This merchant and this monk, a day or tweye.
The thridde day, this merchant up ariseth (*ShipT B* 1263-5)

also *MchT E* 1965 ff., 2217 ff., *SqT* 290 ff. Thus Chaucer in the *Knight's Tale* wishes to indicate the time consumed by the journey of Theseus and Hippolyta from Scythia to a point on the road toward Athens. The presence of this lapse of time in Chaucer's conception of the story is perhaps responsible for inserting his "post script" at this exact point, for this was the most logical place for such an addition.

SO-CALLED PROLOGUE TO THE *KNIGHT'S TALE* 301

to tell their stories. Let everyone tell his tale in turn, and now let us see who will win the supper." This inserted passage is thus organic within itself, though it lacks organic relationship with its context.

Such an inorganic insertion is not unexampled in Chaucer's works. There is, for instance, a similar passage in the Prologue to the *Nun's Priest's Tale* (B 3961-80) which is generally considered, on the basis of internal and external evidence, to have been added at a later date. Apparently after Chaucer had already written a prologue to the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, he decided to place the *Monk's Tale* before it, and added a twenty-line passage in order to link this prologue with the last line of the *Monk's Tale*. These added lines were not placed at the beginning of the prologue, but were inserted between lines 4 and 5 of the earlier text, just as these eighteen lines were inserted between lines 16 and 17 of the *Palamon*.⁵

Let us now examine these eighteen lines in order to determine their relationship to the context. They consist essentially of two parts: a ten-line *occupatio*, followed by the eight lines containing the reference to the Canterbury framework. The following examination will concern itself with the first ten lines of the insertion.

After the first couplet (875-6) introducing the *occupatio*, these lines recount in orderly succession the incidents mentioned in the older *Palamon*, here preserved in the sections of the *Knight's Tale* immediately preceding and following the insertion. Light is accordingly thrown upon the meaning of the individual lines by referring to the lines in the surrounding passage which they repeat. The second couplet—

How wonnen was the regne of Femenye
By Theseus and by his chivalrye (A 877 f.)—

⁵ In the case of the *Pro NPT* variation in the MSS show clearly that the twenty lines are a later insertion. These variations are probably due to the fact that the lines occur in a link between two tales. In the case of the "prologue" of the *KnT*, on the other hand, the passage occurs within the tale itself. The greater divergence in the former case is to be expected; apparently many of the tales were circulated separately thus producing considerable textual variation in the MS authority of the links, and preserving more unified that of the tales.

directly parallels a couplet in the earlier stratum,

What with his wysdom and his chivalrie
He conquered al the regne of Femenye (A 865 f.)

and covers the action in a long section of the first book of the *Teseide*. The third couplet elaborates upon the second one. The fourth,

And how assegded was Ypolita,
The faire, hardy queene of Scithia (A 881 f.)

repeats material from various lines in the other portion of the Tale. The siege had been mentioned in line 866, and Scythia and Hippolyta in the following couplet:

That whilom was ycleped Seithia,
And weddede the queene Ypolita (A 867 f.),

and the whole matter is treated more fully in the first book of the *Teseide*. Thus the close echo in lines 877-882 of material in the body of the Tale removes any possible doubt as to the incidents referred to and at the same time serves to establish Chaucer's method in the *occupatio*. It will be seen that the correspondence extends even to the use of the same riming words, *his chivalrie*: *the regne of Femenye*, ll. 865 f. and 877 f., and *Scithia*: *Ypolita*, ll. 867 f. and 881 f. Four riming expressions are thus repeated within eighteen lines of text.⁶ It is difficult to believe that if these lines had been written continuously Chaucer would have repeated himself in this fashion.

Having noted the method employed in lines 877-882, we proceed to consider the fifth and last couplet of these ten lines:

And of the feste that was at hir weddynge,
And of the tempest at hir hoom-comynge (A 883 f.)

Here again matters are referred to which have already been mentioned in the Tale. But the particular sense in which certain words in this couplet are used may be open to question. *Feste*, for example, could mean either a specific feast or a general festivity

⁶ Nowhere else in Chaucer is there quite such a striking instance of repetition. Cases of four riming words within passages of 22 lines may be noted in *Pro WBT* D 3-24 and *PdT* C 815-836. Seven other cases within passages of less than 35 lines occur in the *Canterbury Tales*. The passage cited above, however, offers the only example which I have been able to find within a passage of less than 22 lines.

of merriment. *Tempest*, also, could mean either a physical storm of wind and rain, or, as Professor Curry⁷ has pointed out, a noise, disturbance, or perturbation of almost any kind. Again, the possessive pronoun *hir* may be either the feminine singular, "her," or the plural "their."

On the other hand, there is less chance of misunderstanding the meaning of *weddynge* and *hoom-comynge*. These two events are first mentioned in an earlier couplet:

And weddede the queen Ypolita,
And broghte hire hoom with hym in his contree (A 868 f.)

From that we see that Theseus married Hippolyta abroad. In the *Teseide*, in fact, they remained in Scythia for two years after their marriage. From the above couplet, furthermore, we see that they came to the shores of Greece together. Therefore, we are to interpret *hir hoom-comynge* as "their homecoming" and *hir weddynge* as, of course, "their wedding."

As for *tempest*, Professor Curry has observed that this word, in the sense of noise or disturbance, might refer to the tempest of applause which greeted the couple on their arrival at the shores of Greece. Obviously there was a noisy demonstration at this reception, and Chaucer's sources emphasize the fact that there was "*gran disio . . . mirabil festa . . . infiniti canti ed instrumenti*" and "*Letifici plausus missusque ad sidera vulgi Clamor*."

We may even go further and note that the *hoom-comynge* included not only the debarkation of the couple, but also their journey toward Athens, for Theseus asks the weeping ladies,

"What folk been ye, that at *myn hom-comynge*
Perturben so my feste with criyng?" (A 905 f.)

We may thus consider "their homecoming" of line 884 as cover-

⁷ W. C. Curry (*MLN.*, xxxvi, 272 ff.) noted this general meaning of the word *tempest*, citing copious examples of its use in this sense in ME and OF. Professor Robinson in his edition of Chaucer, however, dismisses the non-physical interpretation of the word as "unnatural" (p. 772). Yet the *NED*. lists as many examples of the word before 1500 in the non-physical senses as in the limited meteorological usage which Professor Robinson would here prescribe for it. To the examples cited by Professor Curry may be added the ME idiom *tempest thee not* ("do not get excited") which occurs twice in Chaucer, and the casual use of the word by Gower (*Conf. Amant.* I, 2142) to refer to the sound of the Trump of Death.

ing the events mentioned at this point in the narrative, when Theseus speaks of *his* homecoming. If so, the word *perturben* (MS Gg *disturblen*) affords a key to the further understanding of the word *tempest* in line 884, for the disturbance or tumult which broke out at this stage in their homecoming is vividly described. The lamentation made by the noble ladies was so loud—

That in this world nys creature lyvynge
That herde swich another waymentynge (A 901 f.)

The word *tempest* thus refers to the entire demonstration which Chaucer had mentioned in his original text (ll. 872-4, 893-908), especially the disturbing noise made by the weeping women. Chaucer says that he will not tell us "fully the manere" of these things—that is, not as fully as they are given in the sources, but instead will proceed to the matter in hand.⁸

The word *feste*, as I have remarked, may refer to the festivities in general, and perhaps the presence of the word in lines 906 may throw light upon its use in line 883. Our general conclusion in regard to lines 883-4 is, then, that this fifth couplet, like the rest of the *occupatio* lines, repeats material from the earlier stratum of the Tale contained in lines 868-874 and 893-908, and may be explained on the basis of the present text of the Tale.

Professor Lowes maintains that the sources of the Tale offer no parallel for the allusion to a *tempest*.⁹ Yet both the *Teseide* and the *Thebaid* make repeated mention of the noisy demonstrations on the arrival of Theseus and Hippolyta in Athens. The *Teseide* speaks of a "*turba di donne*" who

Si si levaron con alto furioso,
Con alte grida, pianto e gran romore (II, stanza 25)

Boccaccio's use of the word *turba* (repeated in stanza 28) is in turn a distinct echo of Statius' *Thebaid*:

⁸ A literal-minded person might say that Chaucer here contradicts himself: he puts the *tempest* among the things which the Knight says he must "forbear," and then proceeds to tell something about it. It is true that Chaucer, inserting these eighteen lines hastily, perhaps did not notice this apparent contradiction. But he is here employing a rhetorical figure, the *occupatio*, which was, for example, a favorite device with Cicero. Everyone will recall Cicero's constant protestations that he would not mention something, which he then proceeded to emphasize with grim insistence.

⁹ J. L. Lowes, "The Tempest at hir Hoom-cominge," *MLN.*, xix (1904), pp. 240-243.

Hunc vulgo monstrante locum, manus anxia Lernae
 Deveniunt: cedit miserorum turba priorum (xii, 512 f.)

The disturbance caused by their lamentations is emphasized in the *Teseide* and also in the *Thebaid*. In the latter it is compared with the noise of the Getic birds:

Unde hoc examen et una
 Tot miserae? . . .
 . . . Geticae non plura queruntur
 Hospitibus tectis truncō sermone volvuntur,
 Cum duplices thalamos et iniquum Tereia clamant
 (xii, 472-480)

Chaucer's mention of a *tempest*, therefore, would seem to have been suggested by his sources.

Professor Lowes, on the other hand, proceeded to explain "the tempest at hir hoom-comynge" as a contemporary allusion on the basis of a reference in the chronicles to a storm which occurred on December 18, 1381, when Anne of Bohemia arrived in England to become the bride of Richard II, and he used this allusion at the same time to date the composition of the Tale. Numerous scholars have accepted this view since its appearance over thirty years ago, and Professor Robinson's endorsement in his edition of Chaucer has given it almost canonical status.

The opening of the *Knight's Tale* is complete within itself, however, and does not need to be explained by any of the events in Chaucer's time.¹⁰ Lowes's interpretation seems, moreover, singu-

¹⁰ O. F. Emerson (*Stud. in Lang. and Lit. in Celebration . . . of J. M. Hart*, pp. 203 ff.) suggested still other allusions to the Richard-Anne match in the marriage of Palamon and Emelye at the end of the Tale. His discussion centered around lines 2970-7, which he felt were not sufficiently paralleled in the Italian source. As one reads the whole Chaucerian passage consecutively, however, one can account for these lines as a purely artistic device by which Chaucer sharpened the focus of the reader's attention progressively from a general idea of a conference in Athens to the specific idea of a marriage between Palamon and Emelye in order to secure for the Athenians "fully obeisance" of the countrymen of Palamon. If Palamon is Richard II, it seems unlikely that Chaucer would suggest that the English were to be subjugated as a result of this marriage. Professor Emerson anticipated this objection by saying that the French were the people whose "obeisance" was to be secured. But if such was Chaucer's intention, why did he not introduce the name of a third country at this point, and thus avoid the danger of seeming to identify Richard with the common enemy

larly inappropriate, for the Theseus-Hippolyta marriage did not in any respect parallel that of Richard and Anne. Theseus conquered Hippolyta, married her in Scythia, and then they proceeded to Greece in company. In the case of Richard and Anne, however, the negotiations for marriage proceeded from Bohemia rather than England. They were not married abroad, but Anne came alone to England, there to meet Richard. Even if we read "her homecoming" in line 884 the application of the phrase to Anne's arrival in England would be forced and unnatural; and if we adopt what seems the more probable reading, "their homecoming," the application to Anne and Richard would be quite impossible. The foregoing discussion has thus tended to establish the possibility suggested by Professor Tatlock that the whole second paragraph of the *Knight's Tale* was a later insertion.

It is interesting to note also in the Squire's Tale what appears to be a very similar use of the *occupatio* device. The Squire has been describing Cambyuskan's "vestiment" and his "feeste." Then in lines 63-75 he remarks that it would take all day to give the particulars of "al th' array" and the courses, and continues:

I wol nat taryen you, for it is pryme,
And for it is no fruyt, but los of tyme;
Unto my firste I wol have my recours (F 73-75)

Within these lines, however, there is an orderly repetition of material which stands before and after. Apparently, then, we have an inserted passage which stresses the exigencies of time, introduces an allusion to the pilgrimage in the mention of "pryme," and then turns back to the interrupted narrative in a phrase which recalls the line in the Knight's Tale: "ther I lefte, I wol ayeyn bigynne." If these lines are omitted, the narrative is in no way impaired; in fact, it gains in dramatic consistency and consecutive-ness. And, most interesting of all, with the removal of this passage, the only allusion to the Canterbury pilgrimage in the entire Tale disappears. Though this mention of *pryme* is obviously a reference to the framework, it does not fit satisfactorily into the

against whom the marriage negotiations had been directed? Professor Manly has also pointed out that the line, "he is a kynges brother sone, pardee" (A 3084) would be strained and unnatural as a reference to Richard II, who was already king in his own right.

Canterbury scheme, inasmuch as nothing more is made of it in this Tale or the next. The opening of the *Squire's Tale* thus offers an interesting analogy to that of the *Knight's Tale*.¹¹

WILLIS J. WAGER

New York University

ANOTHER ANALOGUE TO THE PRIORESSES TALE

In the *Summa Praedicantium* of John Bromyard, a work apparently composed in the seventh decade of the fourteenth century,¹ I have come upon the following hitherto unpublicized analogue to Chaucer's *Prioreses Tale*:

. . . Idem ostenditur per aliud miraculum, quod de ea legitur, quomodo videlicet clericum quandam a Iudeis occisum, resuscitauit. Hic namque clericus in villa quadam moram traxisse dicitur, in qua multi habitabant Iudei; in quorum infidelitatis testimonium cum per vicum, in quo morabantur, transiret, saepius aliquam cantilenam de beata Virgine cantare solebat. De quo Iudei offensi tempus aptum expectantes, ipsum vno die occulte acceptum occiderunt, & in cloacam proiecerunt. Cito post, cum sacerdos ad ecclesiam veniret, & clericum non inuentum quaereret, audiuit ipsum de cloaca² cantilenam beatae Virginis alte clamantem; qui Christianos secum adducens, ipsum de loco illo eduxerunt, narrantem, quomodo per beatam Virginem ad vitam³ resuscitatus fuerat.

¹¹ There are other noteworthy points of similarity between the *KnT* and *SqT*. Both lack adaptation throughout to the characters who are telling them. The Squire, for example, appears to be saying at line 281 that he is not as "fresh as May." The whole leisurely manner of the fragmentary Tale, moreover, seems ill suited to the Squire. If the *SqT* were completed according to the outline given at the end of the fragment as it now stands, it would be a tale of the proportions of the *KnT*. Both tales are romances, divided into *pars prima*, *pars secunda*, etc. The subject matter of the two is related through the intermediary of the *Anelida* and *Arcite*.

¹ See Owst, G. R., *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, Cambridge, 1933, pp. 224 and 596. Mr. Owst cites among other references Welter, J.-T., *L'exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du moyen âge*, Paris, 1927, pp. 329-30, q. v. The text which follows is taken from the edition of the *S.P.* printed in Antwerp in 1614. I have collated with it the editions of Basel, 1484; Nuremberg, 1518; and Venice, 1586. The only variations of these from the Antwerp text are noted. The punctuation of the text is my own.

² Nuremberg and Venice, *cloaco*.

³ Nuremberg and Basel, *vite for ad vitam*.

In his study of the development of the *Prioresses Tale*, published in 1910 by the Chaucer Society, Professor Carleton Brown made it very clear that the history of the legend is quite complicated and that his conclusions, based upon a relatively small number of texts, twenty-seven, were necessarily tentative.⁴ This Bromyard version multiplies the known complications in the history of the story. Professor Brown found that his versions could be divided into three main classes;⁵ but this one does not fit well into any of them. It begins with a boy whom we recognize as the familiar school-boy of groups A and C;⁶ he cannot be the chorister of B group because a choir-boy could not have made regular trips through the Jewish quarter.⁷ But the mother of the boy is not mentioned here; and her absence from the story is one of the distinguishing features of B versions.⁸ It cannot be argued that she is left out because the author wished to be brief and chose not to mention who first became anxious about the boy; the Bromyard text specifically states that it was the priest. One of the details of this version is peculiar to the C group: never in stories outside that division is the body thrown into a jakes.⁹ And finally, to make matters worse, the conclusion to our version is a typical A ending. In most of the C versions the boy is found dead and is not restored to life. And in the two (or three) in which he does live again his resurrection occurs after he has been carried to the church.¹⁰ In other words, nowhere in group C do the searchers find him really alive. But in the A stories he has already been

⁴ Brown, Carleton, *Study of the Miracle of Our Lady Told by Chaucer's Prioress*, London, 1910. Ch. Soc., 2 ser., no. 45. See pp. vi, vii, 99, and *passim*. Since it is obviously impossible to present here any of the details of Professor Brown's analysis, it is necessary to assume that the reader is somewhat familiar with his monograph. An earlier work on the same subject by Professor Brown is "Chaucer's Prioress' Tale and its Analogues," *PMLA.*, XXI, 486-518. This study is superseded by the Chaucer Soc. monograph.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 57 ff.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 119-20.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 57-8.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

¹⁰ See C II, p. 35, and C VIII, p. 44. C I, p. 34, does not state specifically whether the boy was finally resurrected or not. But here too he was not alive when the searchers found him: ". . . Inuenerunt puerum mortuum."

ANOTHER ANALOGUE TO THE PRIORESSES TALE 309

resuscitated when the searchers arrive.¹¹ The conclusion of B versions is of course completely different from that of this Bromyard text.¹² Thus, we have before us a definitely A conclusion.

There are, then, distinctive features of all three of Professor Brown's groups in this one story. The tentative nature of Professor Brown's conclusions ought, I think, to be emphasized. He relied principally upon collections of legends of the Virgin in securing his analogues. But why should not the story occur in any medieval anthology of religious tales? The number of such collections is, of course, enormous. In Appendix III of *L'exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du moyen âge*,¹³ Welter lists over seven hundred manuscripts containing more or less extensive groups of religious stories. Confronted by such an overwhelming mass of uninvestigated material, one cannot but doubt that Professor Brown's twenty-seven versions represent adequately the development of the story. It may be that they do; but here is indeed a twenty-eighth which does not fit into his groups.

The location of known versions suggests a further likely field for search for others. The seventh text of Professor Brown's B group is taken from the *Speculum Exemplorum*,¹⁴ a late fifteenth century collection of stories which, though designed to be useful to all Christians, was compiled with preachers particularly in mind.¹⁵ The first version of C group is found in a manuscript which also contains sermons,¹⁶ and which, therefore, was very probably addressed to preachers. The appearance of the story in the *Summa Praedicantium*, one of the most famous of the medieval books of sermon materials produced in England,¹⁷ would appear to lend significance to the locations of the texts just mentioned. The

¹¹ See pp. 1 ff.

¹² See pp. 20 ff.

¹³ See note 1.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

¹⁵ I have not seen a copy of this work; but J.-T. Welter, *op. cit.*, p. 388, summarizing the author's prologue, says: "Il les [the exempla] a réunis en un seul livre . . . où il est donné à tout chrétien de voir comme dans un miroir très pur la beauté ou la laideur de ses actions. Puis il se met à donner des conseils pratiques aux prédicateurs qui se serviront de son recueil"

¹⁶ Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

¹⁷ See Owst, G. R., *Preaching in Medieval England*, Cambridge, 1926, pp. 224 and 279.

story was very likely in fairly frequent use as a pulpit exemplum. A search of sermon manuscripts for further versions would probably be productive of results.

WOODBURN O. ROSS

University of North Dakota

A NOTE ON CHAUCER'S PARDONER'S PROLOGUE

One of the subtlest devices used by Chaucer's pardoner to extort money from the ignorant upon whom he preyed was the form of blackmail which he proudly demonstrates to the Canterbury pilgrims in the following passage:

Goode men and wommen, o thyng warne I yow:
If any wight be in this chirche now
That hath doon synne horrible, that he
Dar nat, for shame, of it yshryven be,
Or any womman, be she yong or old,
That hath ymaad hir housbonde cokewold,
Swich folk shal have no power ne no grace
To offren to my relikes in this place.
And whoso fyndeth hym out of swich blame,
He wol come up and offre in Goddes name,
And I assoile him by the auctoritee
Which that by bulle ygraunted was to me.
By this gaude have I wonne, yeer by yeer,
An hundred mark sith I was pardoner.¹

That Chaucer drew upon a contemporary source for this passage has been suggested by W. B. Sedgwick, who has called attention to a thirteenth-century German analogue in the *Pfaffe Ameis*.² In the latter the identical trick used by the pardoner is described, and the passage ends with a description of the women flocking forward to the speaker with their gifts lest they be suspected of infidelity.

A closer analogue, hitherto unnoted, appears as an exemplum in a fifteenth-century Latin collection of religious narrative, where the trick is definitely attributed to a pardoner of Ferrara:

Quidem querens quaestam Ferraria post predicationem suam dixit dominibus cum deberent offerre, dixit: Si est aliqua domina quae fecerit

¹ Robinson, *Chaucer's Complete Works*, p. 180, ll. 377-390.

² *MLR.*, xix (1924), 336-7.

*fallum de marito, uel de persona sua, non ueniat ad offerendum, quoniam mansio, uel domus nostra, non uult talem pecuniam, uel oblationem, et tunc omnes inerunt ad offerendum, et quae non habebat pecuniam accipiebat mutuo ut non suspicaretur de fallo.*⁸

Together the two analogues suggest very definitely that Chaucer has used a contemporary source for the passage, probably an exemplum very much like the one quoted. The objection that the exemplum is found in a fifteenth-century manuscript is not valid, for almost always individual exempla were older than the collections in which they appeared, and in this particular case the appearance of the story in the *Pfaffe Ameis* definitely establishes its antiquity. Chaucer's source may well have been an exemplum of the fourteenth century, for at that time opposition to pardoners was growing intense, and it was probably during that century that the story of the blackmail trick, told of a priest in the *Pfaffe Ameis*, was changed to make it another expression of distrust of the pardoners.

EDWARD H. WEATHERLY

Northwestern University

A NOTE ON THE MILLER'S PROLOGUE

For I wol telle a legende and a lyf
Bothe of a carpenter and of his wif

CT. (1) 3141-3142

This note is to suggest an interpretation of line 3141 above which may add a bit to our conception of Chaucer's conscious artistry in the first dramatic clash of his Human Comedy. The host has just requested the monk to tell something to match the knight's "noble storie." The drunken miller, interrupting, takes up the challenge by asserting in "Pilates voys" that he will tell a "noble tale." In other words, he drunkenly boasts that he will meet the knight on his own ground. All this is immediately obvious. But after Bailey, unsuccessful in his efforts to sidetrack the miller, calls him a drunken fool and permits him to proceed, the latter, as indicated above, promises to tell a "legende and a lyf." He has already agreed to match the knyght. Now in his

⁸ Harleian MS. 3938, ff. 124b-125.

reference to saints' legends he turns and challenges also the monk, whom he has pushed into the background and whose place he is taking. The quoted phrase suggests this. And the monk's words when he is again invited to entertain the company tend to confirm this suggestion:

And if you list to herkne hyderward
I wol you seyn the lyf of Seint Edward,
Or ellis, first, tragedies wol I telle.

CT. (vii) 1969-1971.

GEORGE R. COFFMAN

University of North Carolina

PRECIOUS STONES IN *THE HOUSE OF FAME*

Few people seem to have noticed that according to the lapidaries the topaz is the stone of chastity, and that this quality agrees with the character of the gentle knight who, in Chaucer's own Canterbury Tale, is thus named.¹ Years ago Professor Sypherd drew attention to the fact that beryl as a stone that fosters love was especially appropriate for the construction of what was at least in literary tradition a court of love edifice, Chaucer's house of Fame. For this particular symbolism Mr. Sypherd quoted evidence from *L'Intelligenza*.² But if beryl carried this meaning in the fourteenth century, the idea is important for our understanding of Chaucer's poem, with reference, for example, to the poet's search for tidings of love.

For whi me thoughte, be seynt Gyle!
Al was of ston of beryle,
Bothe the castel and the tour,
And eke the halle and every bour,
Wythouten peces or joynynges.³

The point really needs further support, especially from the source

¹ The honor of the discovery goes to W. O. Ross, *MLN.*, XLV (1930), 172 ff. See also *English Mediaeval Lapidaries*, J. Evans and M. S. Serjeantson, *EETS.*, 190, London, 1933, pp. 19, 106, and 122. Cf. J. M. Manly, *Cant. Tales*, N. Y. [1928], p. 630, and the text B. 1935.

² W. O. Sypherd, *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame*, Chaucer Soc., London, 1907, p. 133, n. 2.

³ *House of Fame*, 1183-1187.

which, it is apparent, Chaucer himself and *L'Intelligenza* both used. A little later in the poem he refers specifically to the "Lapidaire"⁴—presumably that of Marbodus—and there we find in the Latin *De Beryllo*:

Hic est coniugii gestare refertur amorem,
Et se portantem perhibetur magnificare.⁵

The form of the word *lapidaire*, however, suggests that Chaucer—one may perhaps say), as usual—consulted a French version as well as the Latin, or even without the Latin. An Anglo-Norman rendering, for example, says of the beryl:

Ome e feme fait entramer
E ki la porte enurer.⁶

In twelfth century prose we find it again thus: "Icest portet amur entre hume et femme et fait honur a celui ki la ported."⁷

⁴ Line 1352.

⁵ Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, CLXXI, col. 1747. Marbode seems to have got the idea from Damigeron: "Gestat amorem coniugii et portantem . maiorem omnium facit" (from twelfth century MSS.), J. Evans, *Magical Jewels of the Mid. Ages and the Ren.*, etc., Oxford, 1922, p. 198 (App. A). Cf. p. 21, and see P. Meyer, *Romania*, XXXVIII (1909), 494. Vincent of Beauvais quotes several authors to the same effect, *Speculum Maius*, VIII, c. xlvi; and the material is found again in Bartholomew Anglicus, *De Propri. Rer.* (Nuremberg, 1492, Hain *2510, Proctor 2073), XVI, cap. xxi, *de Berillo*. Cf. Trevisa's rendering, ed Wynken de Worde, 1496, XVI, cap. XX.

⁶ P. Studer and J. Evans, *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries*, Paris, 1924, p. 40, 313-314, probably from England in the first half of the twelfth century (cf. p. 24). Also in L. Pannier's *Les Lapidaires Français*, etc., Paris, 1882, p. 45. Cf. the adaptation, Studer and Evans, p. 84, 395-396.

⁷ Studer and Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 99; also *Romania*, XXXVIII, p. 273. Note also in the "second prose lapidary," Studer and Evans, p. 131: "Le beril nurist amur entre homme et femme," etc. (cf. Evans, *Magical Jewels*, p. 218); in the third, p. 143; an original touch appears in prose, p. 153: "Ki sur lui la porte, si se combat a sun enemi, il le veintera" (cf. Barthol. Angl., *De Propri. Rer.*, Trevisa's trans., XVI, c. xx: "the vertue of berell that is moost pale is beste ayenste peryll of enmyes & ayenst stryfe . . ."); also the Cambridge version, p. 167:

El est mult bone a oes a femme
Ki voelt aveir par grant honur
Tuz tens l'amur de sun seignur;
E ki la porte netement
En honur creist; . . .

Further examples may be found on pp. 214 and 291 ("Icest piere garde

This formula or something like it is often repeated. In a fifteenth-century Middle English lapidary of London, based on a French original, it appears once more: "The boke seith þat berill norissheth loue betwene man and woman . . . & who þat berith hit shall be muche worshipped."⁸

From these passages and the common tradition they represent it is clear that the beryl has a twofold appropriateness in Chaucer's poem. To this the poet adds another, namely that beryl shines like glass and makes everything "more than hit was."⁹ In view of Chaucer's use of court of love material, it is interesting to note that the lapidaries often refer specifically to wedded love. As Trevisa renders Bartholomew Anglicus, the beryl "makyth a man grete of state: & loueth well loue of matrimony."¹⁰

Another stone used in the poem is the ruby. Fame sits:

in a see imperiall,
That mad was of a rubeall,
Which that a carbuncle ys yealled.¹¹

The carbuncle itself in the lapidaries is distinguished for its power of illumination.¹² Perhaps it appeared in that way in accounts of the Otherworld realm similar to that of Fame which the poet directly or indirectly knew,¹³ and so its use here was first suggested.

"l'amur des entreposez"); also *Romania*, xxxviii, 64 (see Studer and Evans, pp. 4 and 84, MS. E) and 502 (Studer and Evans, p. 214); *RF*, xvi (1904), 394; Pannier, *op. cit.*, p. 92, and cf. *ZRPh*, xxxii (1908), 692. Note also Pannier, p. 123, and cf. *ZRPh*, xxxvii (1913), 95; also Pannier, pp. 257 f., 631 ff. ("Honorez est qui beryl porte"); Evans, *Magical Jewels*, p. 226 ("Et amorem coniugum reconciliat. Gestantes magnificat.")

⁸ Evans and Serjeantson, *English Med. Lapidaries*, p. 28 (cf. p. 16). For others see pp. 48, 72, and 125.

⁹ *House of Fame*, 1288-1291.

¹⁰ Lib., xvi, cap. xx.

¹¹ 1361-1363.

¹² So Marbodus, col. 1754 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, clxxi); Studer and Evans, *Anglo-Norm. Lap.*, pp. 49, 519 ff.; 110; 153; 175; Evans, *Magical Jewels*, 227; etc.

¹³ One may recall the palace in the *Pelerinage de Charlemagne* (with the two youths each holding an ivory horn) illuminated by a carbuncle on a pillar, ed. E. Koschwitz, *Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerus.*, etc., Leipzig, 1913, 423 and 442 ff. Cf. *Speculum*, vii (1932), pp. 500 ff., especially 508, 510, and 511; *Scandinavian Studies*, x (1929), pp. 190 ff.; *Speculum* ix (1934), pp. 200-201; *MP*, xxv (1928), 340-1; Skeat, *Com-*

PRECIOUS STONES IN THE HOUSE OF FAME 315

But the real point in the present context is the ruby, for which "carbuncle" is merely a definition. Of this variety, although Marbodus tells us nothing in his Latin, the French lapidaries offer an account with special importance for us here:

Rubi escharbuncle done amur de seignurage
E maintient home en (grant) vasselage.
(E) done amur de Deu e de gent,
D'ami e d'amie ensement.¹⁴

In thirteenth-century prose the ruby "est de si haute seignurie, ke si homme ki la porte vent entre genz, tuz luy portent honur et grace et tuz s'esjoisent de sa venue."¹⁵ The same theme appears in the London Lapidary: ". . . the gentil rubie fyne & clene is lorde of stones. . . . He is of suche lordeshippe þat when he þat bereth hym cometh amonge men, all thei shul bere hym honeur & grace & all shul bere hym joye of his presence." He "wynneth to a man lordeshippe above oþre stones."¹⁶

The symbolism therefore is strikingly appropriate in the *House of Fame*. But one may perhaps question whether Chaucer had it in mind; for he uses the ruby elsewhere in a different way, notably as an emblem of martyrdom in the *Prioress's Tale*.¹⁷ In the *Legende of Good Women*, however, he seems to show a reminiscence of the lapidaries when he speaks of the ruby "that shynede by nyghte"¹⁸—more significant, I think, as evidence than a similar

plete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, III (Oxford, 1900), p. 275, n. on 1363; also the *Romaunt of the Rose*, 1120-1128, and *Cant. Tales*, B. 2061.

¹⁴ Studer and Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 89, 547-550 (from England "probably not before the middle of the thirteenth century," p. 71); also *Romania*, XXXVIII, 67.

¹⁵ Studer and Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 126. See pp. 116 f. for relations with the *Lapidaire Chrétien* and cf. Pannier, *Les Lapid. Fr.*, pp. 246, 283 ff. Also see *RF.*, XVI (1904), p. 391; in Latin, Evans, *Magical Jewels*, 215 ("dat graciam et fauorem et gaudium").

¹⁶ Evans and Serjeantson, *Eng. Med. Lapid.*, p. 21. Other instances are on pp. 41, 110, and 123 f.

¹⁷ B. 1800. There are many uses of the ruby in medieval literature. Cf. "heo is rubie of ryhtfulness," *Eng. Lyrics of the XIII Cent.*, Oxford, 1932, p. 149, 46; four jewels under the rain-making stone in Chrétien's *Yvain*, 426 ff.; cf. also Boccaccio, *Decam.*, II, v; *Piers Plowman*, B ii, 12 (ed. Skeat, Oxford, 1886, I, p. 40); Dante's *Paradiso*, xix, 4; etc.

¹⁸ 1119. The scene is Libya, where, the lapidaries tell us, rubies may be found. For the phrase cf. Studer and Evans, *Anglo-Norm. Lap.*, p. 139: "et vous di ke ki metroit le rubin fin en une sale par nuit sans

allusion to the carbuncle would have been. In any case one cannot pass over the specific reference in the *House of Fame* to the "Lapidaire," the sort of treatise which, I suspect, Chaucer was likely to examine. But another interesting question presents itself, in view of the fact that the ruby in works of this kind does not seem commonly to be associated with love. Into the story of Troilus and Criseide the poet deliberately introduces the figure of the ruby and the ring. "And, be ye wis as ye be fair to see," says Pandarus, pleading with Criseyde, "Wel in the ryng than is the ruby set."¹⁹ "O ryng, fro which the ruby is out falle," exclaims Troilus in his beautiful ode to the empty house after Criseyde's departure. To crown these examples, we have finally the *broche*, "gold and azure," "In which a ruby set was lik an herte," which Criseyde gave to him in the days of their happiness. Curiously enough the ring and the ruby appear again, this time as the gift of Troilus, in Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*.²⁰ Curiously again this seems to replace the other "broche" which Troilus, according to Chaucer,²¹ gave to Criseyde.

In these passages the ruby seems to have more or less reference to the love-affair. A heart-shaped jewel of red was a natural symbol of passion, and, by transference, of the lady herself perhaps. Stones of this kind Chaucer had almost certainly seen in actual life. One is of particular interest to us as an example, "le bonne rubie" which John of Gaunt left in his will to his wife Katharine. The gem may have a literary history—that is, if we may be permitted to indulge in that gossip which Fama is prone to spread; for it seems to turn up on the neck of Joan Beaufort (granddaughter of John of Gaunt and Katharine) in her lover's poem, the *Kingis Quair*:

About hir neck, quhite as the fyre amaille,
A gudely cheyne of smale orfeverye,

lumiere, qu'i geteroit ausi grant resplendeur comme une candoille." Also see Simund de Freine, *Œuvres*, ed. J. E. Matzke, *SATF.*, Paris, 1909, p. 18, 467-468. Note Marbodus with reference to the carbuncle (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, CLXXI, col. 1754): "Huius nec tenebrae possunt extingue lucem"; so too Evans, *Magical Jewels*, p. 227.

¹⁹ ii, 584-585; cf. iii, 890-891. The next two quotations respectively come from v, 549 and iii, 1370-1371.

²⁰ Lines 582 ff.

²¹ v, 1660-1661; cf. *Filos.*, viii, 9-10.

PRECIOUS STONES IN THE HOUSE OF FAME 317

Quhareby there hang a ruby, without faille,
Lyke to ane herte schapin verily,
That, as a sperk of lowe, so wantonly
Semyt birnyng upon hir quhyte throte.²²

Did James I draw from the treasury of the *Troilus* or from experience? On the other hand, another ruby, this one in a ring, appears with what I take to be a similar meaning in Guillaume de Machaut's *Fonteinne Amoureuse*, where the Prince's lady bestows it on her lover, or so he dreams, and he finds it on his finger when he wakens.²³ One may also note, perhaps, in Chaucer's line "Wel in the ryng than is the ruby set" a chance echo of a phrase very common in the lapidaries regarding this stone: "Ele deit estre mise en bon or."²⁴ Possibly both expressions reflect some current proverb. In any case, the interpretation of the ruby in the *Troilus* does not make the use of the stone less appropriate in the *House of Fame* as a symbol sometimes of love and generally of honor and renoun.

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

²² 330-335. The reference in John of Gaunt's will may be found in S. Armitage-Smith's *John of Gaunt*, etc., N. Y. and London, 1905, p. 426. Elizabeth of Hainaut left a gold ring with a ruby and an emerald to a Prioress, according to Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer*, N. Y. [1926], p. 208. Several balas rubies were bought by John of Gaunt (*Register*, ed. Armitage-Smith, Camden Soc., London, 1911, 3d. s. 21, II, pp. 193, 194) and the Earl of Derby (*Expeditions to Prussia*, etc., ed. L. T. Smith, Camden Soc., London, 1894, n. s. 52, p. 287, 25 ff., with comment p. lxxi). For modern interpretations of the symbolism of the ruby see I. Kozminsky, *The Magic and Science of Jewels and Stones*, N. Y., 1922, p. 348, and G. H. Bratley, *The Power of Gems and Charms*, London, 1907, p. 124.

²³ *Oeuvres*, ed. E. Hoepffner, III (Paris, 1921, SATF.), pp. 232 ff., 2504, 2711 and 2843.

²⁴ Studer and Evans, *Anglo-Norm. Lap.*, p. 127. Cf. also p. 139, and even of the balas ruby, p. 140: "et doit estre assis en or ausi come li rubis." The same thing is said of some other stones, notably the topaz. See also *RF.*, xvi, 391; Evans, *Eng. Med. Lapid.*, p. 124, etc., and for another possible echo Dante, *Paradiso*, xxx, 66.

A POSSIBLE RELATION BETWEEN CHAUCER'S LONG LEASE AND THE DATE OF HIS BIRTH

One of the unexplained facts in Chaucer's life is his leasing a house for fifty-three years when he himself was in his fifties. The terms of the lease were such as to render the more inexplicable the extraordinary length of this contract. The house could not be sub-let, and the lease was to expire immediately upon his death.¹ Thus if he had children they would be unable to continue in possession. Whether Chaucer realized it or not, he was within eight months of his death when in December, 1399, he rented the tenement in the garden of St. Mary's Chapel in Westminster Abbey. Certainly he did not think he would live to be more than a hundred years old. And why choose a term of precisely fifty-three years? Why not fifty, the round number?

Possibly the most sensible explanation has been that Chaucer took over an unexpired lease, of a long tenure.² However, the history of the dwelling just before and just after Chaucer's occupancy is against this theory. John Edryk, usher of the exchequer, is in possession from 1397 to 1399. Chaucer has it from December, 1399, until, presumably, his death on October 25, 1400. At Michaelmas, 1400, a Master Paul (perhaps the king's physician, a Florentine, Master Paul de Monte) has the lease. In 1403 William Horscroft, a London skinner, is paying rent for the second year of a *seven year* lease.³ From 1411 to 1434 Thomas Chaucer appears to be the occupant, evidently under the terms of a new lease.⁴ These leases of but a few years do not indicate inheritance of a long contract. If John Edryk leased the dwelling for fifty-three years and occupied it for but two, and Chaucer took over the remaining fifty-three years, why should not the same long lease pass to those who succeeded Chaucer? Instead, it expired at his death, just as it passed rather quickly from his immediate successors. The differing sums paid also suggest a policy of new

¹ *Life-Records of Chaucer*, Pt. IV, ed. R. E. G. Kirk, London, 1900, Record 280, pp. 329-330.

² Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, ed. J. M. Manly, 1928, p. 34.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁴ As discovered by Dr. Edward Scott, of the British Museum, while calendaring the Muniments of Westminster Abbey. Kirk, R. E. G., in *Life-Records*, Pt. IV, p. 330, Note I.

leases. Where Chaucer paid 53s. 4d., Master Paul paid 60s., Horscroft 41s., and Thomas Chaucer apparently 66s. 8p. (26s. 8d.?).⁵ The changing amount of rental, the leases for seven years and other periods of time, the expiration of the lease at Chaucer's death, are all opposed to the hypothesis that Chaucer took over the remaining years of a long lease.

Another point to be taken into consideration is the coincidence of Chaucer's leasing a house for fifty-three years at a rental of some fifty-three shillings. The fifty-three shillings, since it is near the rent paid by other leasees, is reasonable; the fifty-three year period is not.

Sometimes one line of thought may lean upon another unable to stand alone, as in architecture two beams lend support to each other. Consideration of the coincidences relating to the lease suggests a possible connection with a point of much greater interest, the date of Chaucer's birth.

The approximate date of Chaucer's birth, long accepted as 1340, is now considered as nearer 1345.⁶ The chief document bearing on the matter is the testimony given at the Scrope-Grosvenor trial in 1386.⁷ This trial in the Court of Chivalry, as it is preserved in the Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, took place before Sir John de Derwentwater in the Refectory of Westminster Abbey. The description of Chaucer preceding his testimony gives him as "Geffray Chaucere, Esquier, del age de XL ans et plus, armez par XXVII ans." If Chaucer were exactly forty years old at the time of this trial in 1386, the date of his birth would be indicated as 1346. The catch comes in the "et plus." Could it be interpreted as the child's "going on" another year, it might mean any period under twelve months. Chaucer, then, would have been born at some date between October, 1345, and October, 1346. However, the careful study made by Professor Samuel Moore of testimony in many cases and especially of the more than two hundred depositions in this case indicates a tendency to give the age in round numbers, counting only by fives and tens; and "et plus," intended originally perhaps to denote a period of months between one birth-

⁵ Kirk, *loc. cit.*

⁶ Manly, John M., *Some New Light on Chaucer*, New York, 1926, p. 66; *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, edited by F. M. Robinson, 1933, p. xv.

⁷ *Life-Records*, Record 193, pp. 264-265.

day and the next, had by Chaucer's time come to be only a formula, almost without meaning. Nevertheless, as Professor Manly has pointed out, we may not assume inaccuracy on the part of Chaucer, who was well-educated, possibly to the precision demanded in a law school,⁸ versed in science and mathematics, and apparently keen in the conduct of business and diplomatic affairs. Chaucer himself proves his accuracy⁹ in this very deposition by his statement that he had been under arms twenty-seven years,¹⁰ the exact period from 1359 to 1386.

Also, the events of Chaucer's life, according to recent opinion, agree rather with a date of birth in the neighborhood of 1345. If born in 1340, Chaucer would have been page to Princess Elizabeth, wife of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, when seventeen, too old probably for such a position. The low amount allowed for clothes in 1357 also suggests the small boy instead of one nearly grown. As to Chaucer the writer, his first extant work, *The Book of the Duchess*, produced about 1369, seems immature for a man of twenty-nine.¹¹

The objections to even as late a date as 1346 do not seem insurmountable. That Chaucer would have been only thirteen when with the army in France is not out of reason; in modern times boys but little older have enlisted. Also, it is not known in what capacity Chaucer served. More difficult to accept is the fact that Chaucer at fourteen should carry a letter from Prince Lionel in France to Edward III in England; but Lionel presumably was able to judge as to the reliability of the youth who had been a member of his family for several years. Another argument advanced in favor of the earlier date is Chaucer's frequent reference to his advancing age; various commentators in answer to this objection have cited similar utterances by poets in middle age or early manhood.¹²

⁸ Manly, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-30.

¹⁰ Chaucer was with the army in France in 1359. *Life-Records*, Pt. IV, Record 34, p. 153.

¹¹ Manly, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

¹² Notably perhaps Eustache Deschamps, a French contemporary of Chaucer's, who before he was forty-five complained as did Chaucer of his years. Manly, *New Light on Chaucer*, pp. 65-66.

It is rather generally conceded then to-day that the facts of Chaucer's life point to a date of birth nearer 1345 than 1340.¹³ Yet even while admitting the probability of Chaucer's accuracy, Chaucerian scholars, following a middle course, incline to put the date of birth around 1343 or 1344.¹⁴

Any connection between the question of Chaucer's birth and his strange action in leasing a house for an unwarrantably long period must make large demands upon the imagination. Let us imagine Chaucer, an old man by the standards of the Middle Ages, renting himself a house. Perhaps his health is not good; perhaps he wishes to settle down for a little uninterrupted writing, after the busy years during which he has been successively an official in Kent, a member of Parliament, Clerk of the Works—a very strenuous job—and subforester of North Petherton Forest. As a younger man he has perhaps preferred to live close to the heart of London. When he selects his first house, after his residence at court, it is over one of the city gates, where from his windows he can look down upon all the varied life streaming into and out of London. Now, eight months before his death, his choice is different. A quiet house this must be; so he seeks him out a dwelling in the garden of St. Mary's Chapel in Westminster Abbey, not far from the abbey mill stream but separated from it by the great gate.¹⁵ He makes the necessary business arrangements with Brother Robert Hermodesworth, Monk of the Abbey and Warden of the Chapel.¹⁶ For how long a period shall he lease the property? Twenty years? Twenty-five? He wishes to spend his last days in this house; what limit shall be set to his life? He cannot quite face that question. Meanwhile he repeats to himself the terms of the rent—a little over fifty-three shillings. Why, he tells the warden, he is but a bit over fifty-three himself. And suddenly Chaucer smiles whimsically. Why not add to the coincidence and save himself the decision? He will lease the house for fifty-three years.

An imaginary scene certainly. And yet there remains the coincidence of figures for the rental and for the years of the lease.

¹³ Manly, *New Light on Chaucer*, p. 66.

¹⁴ Manly, *loc. cit.*; Robinson, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵ As indicated by leases to other tenants. Manly, *Canterbury Tales*, p. 6.

¹⁶ Kirk, in Foreword to *Life-Records*, p. 1.

Chaucer seems to have been the kind of man who, given two identical figures, might thus match them with a third, especially if at the same time he could avoid facing a disagreeable fact.

While we admit that this explanation is far-fetched and leans too heavily upon coincidence, it does fit with the known facts of Chaucer's life, where otherwise the length of lease is inexplicable and the date of birth does not tally with the evidence at the trial. If Chaucer was more than fifty-three in December of 1399, he was born in 1346 or, less probably, late in 1345. In October of 1386, then, he could well be the age stated in the only documentary evidence we have—forty and more.

HAZEL ALLISON STEVENSON

Florida State College for Women

A MEDIAEVAL FRENCH ANALOGUE TO THE DUNMOW FLITCH

Few British popular customs have had such an enduring life as that manifested by the Dunmow Flitch. Barring occasional interruptions, this quaint ceremony has remained in force ever since its institution, which tradition assigns to the twelfth or thirteenth century.¹ Since 1921 it has been celebrated annually and

¹ According to James Caulfield, *Portraits, Memoirs, and Characters of Remarkable Persons* (London, 1820), IV, 151, the practice was begun "in or about the year 1111 by Robert, son of Richard Fitz-Gilbert, Earl of Clare," but William Hone in *The Everyday Book* (London), II (1827), 803, makes Robert Fitzwalter (reign of Henry III) the original donor. For the earliest documentary evidence that the flitch was offered, two entries in the Chartulary of Dunmow Priory, which record presentations in 1445 and 1510, see J. W. R. Scott, "The Peer Who Won the Dunmow Flitch," *The Essex Review*, XXI (1912), 195 f. C. D. H. Grimes in "The Dunmow Chair," *The Antiquary*, I (1905), 309, conjectures that the custom was attached to the tenure of the manor since it was continued after the priory had been dissolved. That the flitch ceased to be offered in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries seems attested by a remark made in *The Weekly Journal* for June 15, 1717, where it is said: "It [i.e., the bacon] has been lately demanded by a Lady of good Fortune and her Husband, who live in Hatton-Garden, which the like has not been known in the Memory of Man, nay, nor Woman; the Gammon was accordingly paid; but 'tis thought the Town will never be at the Charge of another." For these references I am indebted to Professor G. L. Kittredge.

has fathered similar trials, before and after that date, in various parts of England.² Allusions to it and to its offspring occur with some frequency in English literature, the best-known instance probably being two lines spoken by the Wife of Bath in her prologue:

The bacon was not fet for hem, I trowe,
That some men han in Essex at Dunmowe.³

It would be interesting to learn what countries other than England observed the practice of awarding a gammon of bacon to that married couple who could truthfully swear they had never rued

² Notices of the trial are lacking in the index to the London *Times* for the years 1915-1919, but an announcement made on May 4, 1920, that the Dunmow pageant would not be held suggests that the competition had taken place the previous year. References in the *Times* to celebrations since 1920 are, by page and column, as follows: June 13, 1921, 7b; June 6, 1922, 6 (photograph), 12e, 16f; May 22, 1923, 9b; June 10, 1924, 9f; June 2, 1925, 14c, 19a (trial broadcasted); June 21, 1926, 16b; September 6, 1927, 15f; June 7, 1927, 9c; May 29, 1928, 9d; May 21, 1929, 10e; August 6, 1930, 8a; August 4, 1931, 12d; August 2, 1932, 13g; August 8, 1933, 7b; May 22, 1934, 7c. An account of the Whichenovre (Staffordshire) celebration, which dates from the fourteenth century, is given in *The Spectator*, Numbers 607 and 608 (October 15 and 18, 1714). Professor Kittredge has called my attention to a trial at Harrogate in June, 1764, described by J. E. Poppelton in "The Flitch of Bacon Oath," *Old Yorkshire*, 1 (1881), 128-9. For a trial at Stonehenge see the London *Times*, June 21, 1926, 16d; for one at Hanworth (Middlesex), August 6, 1929, 8d; for one broadcasted from Calne (Wiltshire), May 25, 1927, 27 f. An unsigned article appearing in the *Times* for September 6, 1927, 15f, tells how the custom is now celebrated. For a notice that Margate will assume responsibility for next year's Dunmow trial see the *Times*, April 27, 1934, 16e, and for mention of a Dunmow Flitch Bacon Company the issue of January 19, 1920, 9f.

³ F. N. Robinson, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 93, lines 217-218. W. W. Skeat, ed., *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, v. (1900), 296, notes a reference to the Dunmow ceremony in *Piers Plowman*. Professor Kittredge has given me other references: (1) in Laud MS. 416 (c1460), printed by Thomas Wright and J. O. Halliwell in *Reliquiae Antiquae* (London, 1865), II, 29; (2) in "An Excellent New Medly," reprinted by William Chappell in *The Roxburghe Ballads*, I (1871), 60; (3) in *Tom Tyler and his Wife*, reprinted by F. E. Schelling in *PMLA*, xv (1900), 264, 284; (4) a musical comedy, *The Flitch of Bacon*, by the Reverend Bate Dudley, performed August 19, 1778, at Drury Lane and mentioned by W. C. Oulton in *The History of the Theatres of London* (London, 1796), I, 74; (5) a skit, "The Humours of Dunmow," appearing

their bargain. That it once obtained in Brittany was pointed out long ago by Tyrwhitt.⁴ Noël du Fail, the Breton writer from whose *Contes d'Eutrapel* his information was quoted, remarked in 1585 that the Breton trial had existed more than five hundred years earlier.

J'ay dit an et jour pour la perfection et comble de la revolution et nombre annal, où nos praticiens jurisconsultes ont tant gambadé et fait des leurs. Car à l'Abbaie Saint Melaine, près Rennes, y a, plus de six cents ans sont, un costé de lard encore tout frais et non corrompu, et neantmoins voué et ordonné aux premiers qui par an et jour ensemble mariez ont vescu sans debat, grondement, et sans s'en repentir.⁵

Fresh proof that a bacon-competition existed in mediaeval France has come to light in an exemplum contained in Jacques de Vitry's *Sermones Feriales et Communes*. This dates, according to Greven,⁶ from the period of de Vitry's cardinalate (1229-1240) and reads as follows:

Aliquando transiui per quandam villam in Francia, vbi suspenderant pernam seu bachelonem in platea hac condicione, vt qui vellet iuramento firmare quod vno integro anno post contractum matrimonium permanisset cum vxore, ita quod de matrimonio non penitusset, bachelonem haberet. Et cum per decem annos ibi pependisset, non est vhus solus inuentus qui bachelonem lucraretur, omnibus infra annum de matrimonio contracto penitentibus.—Ecce quam pauci hodie vxoribus suis fide et dileccione sicut instituit Dominus noster Jhesus Christus qui est benedictus in secula seculorum. Amen.⁷

If the circumstances and conditions of the Dunmow trial are compared with those of St. Melaine, it will be seen that they agree in two respects: in both places the prize was granted by a

in *The Universal Songster* (London, 1834), I, 48. Dr. B. J. Whiting has pointed out to me two songs, "Mr. Clark and his Bacon," by George Colman, and "The Flitch of Bacon," both in *The Universal Songster*, I, 198, 64.

⁴ Thomas Tyrwhitt, ed., *The Canterbury Tales of Chaucer* (London, 1830), IV, 223. The note does not occur in the first edition (1775-1778). Tyrwhitt mistakenly printed "Eutrapē" for "Eutrapel," an error repeated by Skeat, *op. cit.*, V, 296.

⁵ C. Hippéau, ed., *Contes et Discours d'Eutrapel* (Paris, 1875), II, 140-141.

⁶ Joseph Greven, ed., *Die Exempla aus den Sermones Feriales et Communes des Jakob von Vitry* (Heidelberg, 1914), p. vii.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 41. The exemplum was also printed by Goswin Frenken in *Die Exempla des Jacob von Vitry* (Munich, 1914), p. 128.

religious establishment, and in both the form of the oath required of the claimants employed the conventional phrase, "a year and a day."⁸ In de Vitry's account, on the other hand, though the time stipulated is an entire year, there is no evidence that the trial took place under religious auspices.

In any case, the combined testimony of du Fail and de Vitry suggests that flitch-competitions occurred in France at a time not very distant from that in which the Dunmow ceremony began. Whether the French custom was older than the English or the converse it would be idle to speculate, but some importance attaches to recognizing that in both countries the practice was current long before Chaucer gave it literary immortality.

CHESTER L. SHAVER

Oberlin College

A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SUBSTITUTION IN THE
ROMAN DE MANDEVIE

The satirical *Roman de Mandevie* (1340) by Jean Du Pin, who later became abbot of Cluny, is composed of eight books, seven in prose, the eighth in rimed "sixains." This last book is a virulent review of the various classes of society from the Pope to the Peasants. The *Mandevie*, which exists in fifteen MSS. in various European libraries, had at least two printed editions, one at Chambéry, chez Antoine Neyret, in 1485, and one at Paris, chez Michel Le Noir, between 1500-1520.¹ The Chambéry edition agrees, except for scribal variants, with all the manuscripts. The Paris edition, made a score of years later, shows only scribal variants² except in one instance — the chapter on the Pope. There, Le Noir, or whoever prepared the edition for him, deliberately took

⁸ The original terms of the Dunmow oath may be those preserved in a distich quoted by Hone, *op. cit.*, II, 807:

He that repents not of his marriage in a year and a day either sleeping
or waking

May lawfully go to Dunmow and fetch a gammon of bacon.

¹ Cf. Louis Karl, *Un moraliste bourbonnais du XIV^e siècle et son œuvre*, Paris, Champion, 1912, and "Le roman de Mandevie et les mélancholies de Jean Dupin," *Revue des Langues romanes*, LXIII (1926), 297-302.

² Karl says of the Paris edition only that "il diffère sensiblement des manuscrits."

out the *entire* chapter as Du Pin had written it, and composed one more in tune with the times, which he substituted for the original.

The spirit of the two periods is clearly shown in these two versions. The abuses are not the same in 1500 as they were in 1340, and Du Pin merely enumerates them and remarks that the duties of the Pope are thus and so. He ventures no word of warning to the wayward Pontiff. At the same time it is noticeable that he uses no other phrases to indicate the superhuman dignity of the Pope than:

Le pappe, qu'est la fleur royault
De quoy noz ames sont lavées.

But Le Noir is distinctly of the early sixteenth century in his substituted version. For him the Pope

... pecher ne pourroit
Comme saint père, ce seroit
Allegué imperfection,

and

Il est Dieu souverain en terre,

an idea that would never have occurred to Jean Du Pin, churchman though he was. Like Du Pin, Le Noir enumerates the present vices and duties of the Pope, but he omits any reference to Avignon, where Du Pin of course locates the papal court, and he does not, as did Du Pin, reproach the Pope with nepotism (giving all the great offices to his "lignaige"), with spending all his time in fortifying and beautifying his castle and palaces, with living in constant dread of being poisoned, etc.

Le Noir places the papal seat at "Romme," but while both he and Du Pin dwell upon "Symonie" at the court, Le Noir is especially aroused by the prevalent contemporary crime of "pardon" selling; and while both he and Du Pin mentioned the duties of the Pope, Du Pin contents himself with saying that the Pontiff should be "high-minded, humble, and benign," whereas Le Noir adds that the Pope *errs* if he does not pray to God tirelessly and surpass all other priests in sanctity. And what is especially new, Le Noir dares to tell the awful fate that will overtake the "Saint père" if he does not fulfil his official duties:

S'il mainne bien et droittement
Les crestiens et justement

Paradis aura en lieu hault,
Mais se il se fait aultrement,
Pugny sera bien aigrement
En enfer qui est ung lieu chault.

In each edition the chapter on the Pope comprises about 120 lines. In his entire substitution, Le Noir uses but one line from the original, "Le prince des tenebres veille."

It was not an uncommon occurrence in the 15th and 16th centuries for an author to insert selections from the works of other writers, contemporary or earlier, into his own works and pass them off as his own; also it is common enough to find the editors of various books, after the authors' decease, swelling the quality and quantity of their own volumes by inserting selections from other writers—and saying nothing about it; and cases can even be found where an editor has changed somewhat the text of a book he was printing. But this Paris edition³ of the *Mandevie* is the first instance I have seen of a deliberate substitution being made for a whole chapter in the middle of a connected work, leaving only one line of the original.

Of course it is not difficult to find plausible reasons for this substitution. Le Noir's edition appeared not only about the time—probably a few years earlier—that Luther brought to a head the discontent long fermenting within the Church, but it was also the time when Louis XII was having trouble with the warlike Jules II. Quite a number of French poems and other pieces that chide the Pope in more or less open terms were written in this period,⁴ inspired either by a sense of patriotism or a feeling that the Church needed reform. This does not mean that the authors were not good Catholics. But the remarks made by Le Noir about His Holiness, as well as those in the *Blason de la guerre du pape* and other contemporary broadsides, show the way the wind was blow-

³ Existing copies of both editions of the *Mandevie* are exceedingly rare. Prof. Karl lists two or three known copies of each edition in his booklet and article I have referred to. I know of two other copies: of the Chambéry edition at the Pierpont Morgan library in New York, and of the Paris edition in the Library of Congress, in the Vollbehr collection. All the copies of the Paris edition are alike.

⁴ For a list of these pieces, cf. Ch. Oulmont, *Pierre Gringore*, pp. 214-228, and *Romania*, VII, 263.

ing, and this substitution by Le Noir in the second edition of the *Roman de Mandevie* is decidedly in the spirit of the times.

We may assume with certainty that the substituted chapter was not taken from any other poem of the period. Le Noir doubtless composed those lines himself, acting with understandable caution when he preferred to put his composition in the middle of another man's book rather than to print it separately, for, if he had been caught after saying that "Hell, which is a hot place, awaits the Pope if he does not conduct himself in seemly fashion," he himself might have come to a much hotter end without having so far to journey.

R. E. PIKE

Minneapolis, Minn.

VICTORIAN AND ARRIDE

The *NED*. states that the term *Victorian* is of American origin and credits E. C. Stedman with its first use in 1875. But it must have been current in England as early as March 1862, for it appears in the journal of Sir William Hardman (*A Mid-Victorian Pepys*, annotated and edited by S. M. Ellis, London, 1923) under that date (*ibid.*, p. 103), "You Victorians seem to have settled down"

Webster's, the *Century*, the *Standard*, and the *New English* dictionaries treat *arride* as obsolete, or at least as archaic, and the *NED*. dates its last use as that by Lamb in 1823. But Hardman uses both *arride* and *arrided* in his journal of March 1862 (*ibid.*, p. 101), "I . . . was greatly arrided . . . by what I saw"; and (*ibid.*, p. 105), "The Sackfull of Newes consists of . . . merry jests such as used to arride our ancestors." That Hardman was not out of touch with the linguistic usage of his time is evident from the fact that he was editor of *The Morning Post* for eighteen years. It is probable, therefore, that the words he uses were familiar to his contemporaries.

J. M. PURCELL

Marquette University

REVIEWS

The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Edited by F. N. ROBINSON. The Cambridge Poets. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1933. Pp. xl + 1133.

Scholars in this country, who often, quite properly, are troubled by the state of higher studies in our universities and who in their own persons feel the intellectual life submerged in routine teaching, in committees, and in the nineteenth hole of one kind or another, have long taken comfort in the achievements of American Chaucerians; for here more conspicuously than in any other field of English studies we have more than held our own. Some years ago I reviewed in these columns Professor Manly's remarkable edition of a selection from the *Canterbury Tales*, and if that work bore all too plainly the marks of a divided purpose, it was still a great achievement which has left, and will continue to leave, its mark. Mr. Manly, for one thing, raised anew the problem of a satisfactory text; he tackled the difficult, perhaps insoluble, puzzle of Chaucer's manuscript and what happened to it at the hands of the first editors—for obviously some of those first scribes to whom the extant MSS. are ultimately due were editors—and he supplied a mass of new illustrative material which if it did not alter profoundly our notion of Geoffrey Chaucer and his world, gave to it a luminous reality which brought it closer to our business and bosoms. The long, laborious studies out of which that splendid fragment grew are still going forward, and we all share Professor Robinson's hope that we shall have before many years that definitive edition of the *Canterbury Tales* which Mr. Manly and Miss Rickert have set out to give us.

But when it does appear it will be a work for specialists. We shall go to it for solutions to our problems and for answers to questions of every sort. We shall hardly put it into the hands of students. And in any case it will be an edition of the *Canterbury Tales*, not of the whole canon.

Professor Robinson has undertaken a very different task: to prepare for the student, teacher, and amateur of Chaucer a dependable edition, fully abreast of modern scholarship, of the poet's complete works. And this he has done with rare distinction. He does not pretend to give in any case a definitive text, but he does give one every word of which represents the mature decision of a competent scholar; and his introductions, explanatory notes, and glossary are models of what such things ought to be. The textual notes are a good deal less satisfactory—I am thinking here once more of the

Canterbury Tales, — but perhaps that was inevitable unless Professor Robinson were prepared to print the whole *corpus* of variant readings — which, he is quite right in thinking, hardly belongs in a library edition. Still I cannot refrain from regretting that he does not *always*, and not merely frequently, record his departures from the Ellesmere MS. *Ellesmere* is so important, and in any case so interesting, that even the non-expert likes to know when the editor rejects its readings and what the rejected reading is. And to have supplied this information would not appreciably have swelled the volume of his apparatus.

The lack of a fuller critical apparatus here is the more to be regretted since Mr. Robinson's text throughout is one of the best things in his edition. We cannot now know, even in the case of works like the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Troilus* for which we have excellent MS. authorities, *literatim* or even *verbatim* what Chaucer wrote. And since these MSS., even the best of them, are faulty, an editor has no choice but to edit. He may do so with the easy eclecticism of Skeat or the rather excessive conservatism of Mr. Manly, but he must make decisions, and since he must, it is altogether better that he should do so in accordance with well-defined principles. Mr. Robinson makes no bones about it. He does not belong, as he confesses, "to the severest critical school." He sees no point in perpetuating the ignorance, the vagaries, and the carelessness of fifteenth-century copyists. He assumes, as Koch does, that Chaucer wrote good verse and good grammar, and where these are ruined by erroneous endings and can be corrected, even from inferior manuscripts, Robinson does not hesitate to make the correction. He has based his text on a collation of all printed materials, with the help, in some cases, of photostats, or even of the MSS. themselves. The result cannot claim to be in the strictest sense a "critical" text, and in the *Canterbury Tales*, Mr. Manly's forthcoming publication of the full apparatus will doubtless compel changes here and there, as it will settle many vexed questions of readings now more or less doubtful. But it is not likely that the changes required will be either numerous or important. Meanwhile, for Chaucer's greatest work Robinson has given a text at once readable and sound.

The *Troilus*, of course, is more difficult, for here we have to do with two, or three, stages of composition. Professor Robinson has found McCormick and Root's description and classification of the manuscripts "thorough and trustworthy," but he does not agree that more than two stages of composition can be identified, α and γ ; the socalled β readings he thinks are merely scribal variants and of no authority. Accordingly, although, like Root, he bases his text on *Corpus*, a γ MS., he rejects all β readings. The resulting text, therefore, differs slightly from Root's, but the differences are trifling. Here again Robinson has corrected obviously "wrong" grammatical forms and has normalized the spelling, in this case to

conform to the orthography of his basic MS., *Corpus*. To all this textual purists may object — what becomes, then, of a critical text? What, indeed? But to the writer, at least, it is clear that the editor of a working edition has no other course. The purist will have to read the MSS. or reproductions of them, or sit with Robinson's text on one side of him and a battery of critical apparatus on the other, bobbing his head incessantly back and forth like the Pardoner's "dowve sitting on a berne." But the reader who wishes to gain an adequate notion of Mr. Robinson's treatment of the text must be referred to the relevant section of the Introduction (pp. xxxii-xxl) and to the textual notes to the several poems (pp. 1000-1048). An excellent specimen of his method, however, is his treatment of the text of the *Parlement of Foules* (pp. xxxv-xxxvi).

The merits of Professor Robinson's text are no doubt a matter of debate; there can be no doubt at all about the excellence of his introduction and notes. They constitute, indeed, a first-rate compendium of Chaucer scholarship to which even experts will turn for guidance and information. Nor is it merely a matter of bibliographical completeness. Mr. Robinson knows indeed what the Germans delightfully call the "literature" of the subject, but all this vast maze of scholarship has been cleared and ordered so that even a novice can find his way; and purely as literary criticism they are often admirable; witness, for example, the introduction to the *Troilus* (pp. 449-453), where his learning, sanity of judgment, and rare critical powers are happily combined. Mr. Robinson rarely slips, and I have noted no errors or omissions of consequence. But Hinckley's interesting note on "the grete Emetreus, the kyng of Inde" (A 2156) should certainly have been mentioned; and it is a pity that editors of Chaucer continue to ignore the late Mr. C. L. Kingsford's *Prejudice and Promise in the Fifteenth Century*, the fourth chapter of which, "The West Country Piracy," is a perfect commentary on the Shipman. Mr. Robinson speaks (p. xxiii) of the "socalled Lollard Knights . . . Sir Lewis Clifford, Sir William Neville, Sir John Clanvowe, and Sir Richard Stury." But were these men in any real sense followers of Wyclif? Waugh has shown, I think, that the term is a misnomer which had best be abandoned (*Scottish Historical Review*, 11, 58-63; 88-92). Nor does there seem to be any good reason for writing Thomas à Becket for the simple — and correct — Thomas Becket (p. 752). And it is quite certain that Thomas Chaucer was not Chief Butler under Richard II: he was first appointed by letters-patent of November 5, 1402. In passing, one is glad to note that Mr. Robinson dismisses the fantastic theory, lately revived by Mr. Krauss, that Thomas was the illegitimate son of Philippa Chaucer, begotten in an incestuous liaison with John of Gaunt, a piece of modern scandal-mongering to which Mr. Manly administers the quietus in an article in the current (July 1934) number of the *Review of English Studies*. Finally

I must express my regret that Mr. Robinson persists in the old Harvard heresy, elsewhere completely abandoned, that the M. E. diphthong variously spelled *ei*, *ey*, *ai*, *ay* was pronounced [ei]. English and Continental scholars hold that the sound was [ai], and the correctness of this view was demonstrated by Professor Malone as long ago as 1926 ("Studies in English Phonology, II," *Modern Philology*, xxiii, 483-490). And in this connection it is well to call attention to Jespersen's contention that the Old and Middle English *nomina agentis* in -ster(e), for example *tapestere* (A 241), were from the first used of both sexes, and are not specifically feminine (*Linguistica*, 420-429, reprinted from *MLR.*, April, 1927). The argument is not entirely convincing, but it ought to restrain teachers from the usual confident etymologizing when they come upon these words in the text.

I have found only a very few misprints; though on this score one can speak with confidence only after long and steady use. But a few I have noted: *synbben* (A 523), read *snybben*; *yowe* (A 3178) read *ynowe*; p. 754a, 1369 read 1359; p. 952a, June 14, 1382, read *January 14, 1382*; p. 800b, *Mr. C. R. Case*, so twice, read *Kase*; p. 800b, Mr. Robinson here says that he has included the so-called Man of Law's Epilogue, but has enclosed it in brackets; but the brackets have been omitted in the text (p. 90). Errors of this sort, however, are rare, and the publishers are to be congratulated on an admirable piece of printing and book-making. The volume runs to over 1170 pages, but it is not over-bulky; the paper is good, the letter-press attractive, and the binding, as far as I can tell from some weeks of hard use, durable.

Professor Robinson's edition has been long in coming, but it was well worth waiting for, and there will be general agreement, I think, that it will hold its own for many a long day as the standard edition of Chaucer's works. The Horatian maxim has been vindicated once more.

M. B. RUUD

The University of Minnesota

Chaucer's Use of Proverbs. By BARTLETT JERE WHITING. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. 297. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, XI.

Dr. Whiting's volume contains a greater wealth of material than the title suggests. To the proverbs in Chaucer are added those in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, in the poems of Deschamps, and in the *fableaux*. There is also a list of line references to the proverbial material in Gower's French works. Though the proverbs from all these sources have, as Dr. Whiting says, been listed before, his collections are fuller than any others.

This material is not limited to proverbs proper, but includes sententious remarks and proverbial phrases, the latter being subdivided into comparisons (*e.g.*, "brown as a berye," "crewel as lyoun"), and others (*e.g.* "thou shalt make castels thanne in Spayne," "to don thy eris glowe"). Both the comparisons and the other proverbial phrases are arranged alphabetically under the most important word in the phrase. The proverbs and sententious remarks, grouped according to the work in which they occur, are frequently accompanied by comments indicating the speaker and the situation which evoked them.

According to Dr. Whiting's count, the 41,987 extant lines of Chaucer contain 187 proverbs, 421 sententious remarks, 372 comparisons and 258 proverbial phrases. For the sake of simplicity and to avoid debatable distinctions between proverbs and sententious remarks, we may total these figures as 608 aphorisms and 630 proverbial phrases. Deschamps, in something over 80,000 lines, has 180 aphorisms and 183 proverbial phrases. Gower, in the 33,444 lines of the *Confessio Amantis*, has 274 aphorisms and 178 proverbial phrases. These figures are not uninteresting as affording a basis of comparison. Dr. Whiting states that "No other poet of repute has made so considerable a use of proverbial material as Chaucer." He also demonstrates the fact that for his generous use of proverbs the poet found a precedent in the *ballades* of Deschamps and in the *fabliaux*. Chaucer's debt to the rhetoricians in this respect Dr. Whiting considers slight.

From studying in their context the proverbial dicta in Chaucer and in the *Confessio Amantis*, Dr. Whiting reaches the following conclusions. In contrast to Chaucer, Gower rigorously excludes proverbs from his stories and employs them chiefly to point a moral. Chaucer employs them in all types of composition, seldom didactically, often humorously, and chiefly for purposes of characterization or of narrative—to cap a climax and to emphasise or prepare for a situation. The last of these statements—that Chaucer used proverbs chiefly as aids to narration and characterization—does not appear to follow inevitably from the evidence presented and is not wholly convincing. There are signs that Chaucer used proverbs chiefly for their own sake. They are distributed through almost all his works: in *Troilus and Cressida* over fifty¹ appear which are not found in *Il Filostrato*; and at the end of the *Manciple's Tale* there is a string of them which contributes nothing either to story or character. To these matters Dr. Whiting has drawn attention. It may further be observed that Chaucer, who usually took pains to assign the Canterbury tales "in character," allotted to himself the so-called tale of Melibee, which is in reality a close-packed and extensive collection of aphorisms bound to-

¹ Whiting lists 61 inserted proverbs in *Troilus*. I have noted over 100.

gether by the slenderest thread of narrative. All this would seem to suggest that Chaucer used proverbs chiefly because he liked them and recognized that his audience also would appreciate their meati ness and memorableness.

Although Dr. Whiting's collection of Chaucer's aphorisms is much fuller than any previous one, his total of 608 reveals that it is far from complete. Some of his omissions are surprising. For instance, a saying of which there are several Chaucerian versions is given in the *Troilus* form: "Thynk nat on smert, and thou shalt fele non,"² but is omitted in the form in which it occurs in *Boece*,³ partly as translation and partly as Chaucer's own gloss: "Noth ing is wrecchid but whan thou wenest it. (*As who seith, thou thiself, ne no wyght ellis, nis a wrecche but whanne he weneth hymself a wrecche by reputacion of his corage*)."⁴ It is also omitted in the form in which it occurs in the *Romaunt*:⁵ "Is no man wrecched, but he it wen"; and in *Fortune*:⁶ "No man is wrecched, but himself it wene." Other cases of repetition have, however, been noted, and this saying is of particular interest in view of its kinship with Hamlet's famous dictum: "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." Again, Dr. Whiting notes that the line "Of poynaunt sauce had hir neded never a del"⁷ contains a reference to the proverb "Hunger is the best sauce," but he fails to note that the warning "Beth war . . . negligence in chas tisinge,"⁸ addressed to parents, refers to the Biblical proverb of which the popular form is "Spare the rod, and spoil the child." It is also difficult to see why "Gret reste stant in litel besinesse,"⁹ a saying found among the *Proverbis of Wysdom*⁹ and in Skelton,¹⁰ should be ignored in a list claiming to be inclusive rather than exclusive, while "Litel jangling causeth muchel reste"¹¹ is recorded. But the collecting of Chaucer's proverbs appears to be a never-ending task. To Haeckel's supposedly complete list Andrea added over 160, and to these results combined Dr. Whiting has added still further. We find, however, that the omissions mentioned here are only a few of at least 150 in the section on Chaucer's aphorisms alone. This in turn adds to Dr. Whiting's total, so that in considering his conclusions as to Chaucer's use of proverbs one must realize that they are based on substantially less than the whole of the available evidence.

Had Dr. Whiting followed the example of two earlier collectors of Chaucer's proverbs, Skeat and Mrs. Haweis, in supplying a finding-index, the value of his work to scholars would have been greatly

² P. 67.

⁷ *CT*, vi, 97-98.

³ Camb. ed., bk. II, pr. 4, l. 22.

⁸ *Truth*, l. 10.

⁴ B fragment, l. 5672.

⁹ L. 57, ed. Zupitza, *Archiv*, 90, 254.

⁵ L. 25.

¹⁰ Ed. Dyce, I, 417, 1410.

⁶ P. 125.

¹¹ P. 129.

enhanced. Yet *Chaucer's Use of Proverbs* will be of service if it arouses interest in a literary phenomenon of which the full significance and far-reaching influence have still to be revealed.

MARGARET GALWAY

New York University

Chaucer's Shipman's Tale: The Lover's Gift Regained. By JOHN WEBSTER SPARGO. FF. Communications, No. 91. Helsinki, 1930.

Two things never change in this shifting world: human nature and the stories men tell. And it is perhaps not the least of the services of the modern folklorist that he has made us aware of how constant these stories are from China to Peru, from the days of the Caliphs to the reign of Mr. Roosevelt. That the *Shipman's Tale* is a *fabliau* is plain on the face of it, and was, as usual, pointed out long ago by the admirable Tyrwhitt; moreover, the presence of two analogues, one of them very close, in the *Decamerone* is evidence that, like the plots of most *fabliaux*, the *motif* has wandered long and far over the face of the earth. Tyrwhitt was not deceived by the similarity between Boccaccio's tale (*Decamerone* VIII, 1) and the *Shipman's Tale*. "This tale," he wrote, "is generally supposed to be taken from the Decameron, Day 8, Novella 1, but I should rather believe that Chaucer was obliged to some old French Fableour, from whom Boccace had also borrowed the groundwork of his novel." But no one followed up his clue, and our knowledge still remains where Tyrwhitt left it in 1775, hovering uncertainly over that lost *fabliau*.

Chaucerians might be willing to leave it at that; not so your modern student of folklore, if he could run down so much as a single elusive cognate. And now we have Mr. Spargo's admirable study of a theme which, if less fruitful than Mr. Griffith's exploration of the Cupid and Psyche *motif*, reveals once more, and no less strikingly, the curious ways of stories—springing up no one knows where or when or how, wandering along hidden paths, falling now and then into the hands of an artist like Boccaccio, only to resume once more their journeyings in oral tradition.

Mr. Spargo disposes quickly of any notion that Chaucer may have got his plot from *Decamerone* VIII, 1 or 2. *The Shipman's Tale* belongs to a type more simple in plot than Boccaccio's: indeed, it is probable that both authors may have started with essentially the same story, which Boccaccio then developed in the direction of greater complexity of plot; whereas Chaucer, as was his way, deepened and enriched the characterization, so that the plot springs out of character, and not the other way round.

The central *motif*, as Mr. Spargo shows, is "simply a lover's gift got back from the mistress by one ruse or another." But the ruse is often complicated, other *motifs* are combined with it, and the tale takes on form and color from every age and almost every land. Numerous as the extant versions are, however, both literary and popular, they are still too few, and the relations between them generally too obscure, to make possible any coherent pattern of evolution. Mr. Spargo is content to fix the type and illustrate it, and to show some at least of its permutations and combinations. That is for the professional folklorist; but the Chaucerian will learn hardly less from the study of his monograph. He will learn something more of the materials on which the genius of Chaucer played; and even if it be true, as Mr. Spargo suggests, that Chaucer could very well have taken his story verbatim from the *fabliau*, it must still be that the air and verve of it, the pure spirit of comedy subtly interfused with real life, are his own. We should give a good deal for some pages of that old French "fableour."

MARTIN B. RUUD

The University of Minnesota

Cleanness, Glossary and Illustrative Texts. Select Early English Poems IX. Edited by Sir ISRAEL GOLLANZ. London [and New York] : Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. 102.

The texts and notes of the late Sir Israel Gollancz's edition of *Cleanness* appeared in 1921 as Volume VII¹ in his series of Middle English alliterative poems. After a lapse of twelve years the glossary and illustrative texts appear as Volume IX. The editor's sudden death prevented him from seeing the glossary in type, and Dr. Mabel Day has supervised the publication, compiling the illustrative material from references in Part I. Besides fourteen pages of selections from the Vulgate, the main source of the poem, there are passages from Mandeville, *Le Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry*, and *Cursor Mundi*.

The glossary exhibits the careful workmanship and the wide knowledge of the alliterative vocabulary that have characterized all the editions of the series. It fittingly marks the end of the many years of loving and fruitful labor that the editor spent on the difficult poems of the alliterative school. Since obscure passages had been explained in the notes, the glossary adds little that is really new to our understanding of the poem. It is not absolutely complete, as my glossary attempted to be for all but the commonest

¹ Reviewed by me in *MLN.*, xxxvii (1922), 355-62.

words.² Thus under *abide* in Sir Israel's glossary, all the variant forms that appear are given, and the different meanings of the word are cited, but one instance (1673) is omitted. The citations under *also*, *as*, which are grouped together, occupy 9 lines to my 34. These omissions are of no importance for the immediate interpretation of the text, but the fuller citations might be of advantage to a student of the poet's usage or characteristic mannerisms as bearing on the problem of authorship.

Among improvements over my glossary are: *dampped* defined 'stifled,' not 'damned,' though *NED.* does not record the verb before 1564; *relygioun* defined '(Jewish) Church' (1156), not 'religious house'; *torres*, 'tors, peak-like shapes' (951), rightly dissociated from *toures* 'towers,' the first being the Welsh *torr*, which appears even in OE. in the meaning 'rock, hill.' *Untwynes*, 'wilt destroy' (757), is shown to be correct by other examples in the *NED.* *Bau[m]e*, 'comfort,' for MS. *banne*, and *boske[n]s*, 'divisions of a cow-shed' for MS. *boskez*, both of which had appeared in the text of Part I, are important corrections. *Hezed*, 'shouted' (1854), fits the context better than my *hezed* 'hastened,' *hyze* 'hasten' elsewhere having *y*; but other instances of this verb from the interjection *hei* are lacking.

Some definitions and etymologies that seem to me incorrect, incomplete, or doubtful, may be worth brief comment. *Allyt* defined '(even) a little' is derived from OE. *on + lýt*. In his note, the editor had translated *draw allyt* 'hesitate at all,' but both the modification 'even' to make the expression equivalent to 'at all,' and the translation of *draw* by 'hesitate' are unjustified, as Batteson's remarks in *MLR.* 19. 95-7, supporting my interpretation of *allyt* as equivalent to *on lyte*, 'with delay,' clearly show. *Fele* (914) is defined 'entrust' and derived from OE. *fólan*, though it might as well be 'make one's way,' if it ever inherits any meaning of the OE. verb. Because of other ME. and modern dialect occurrences, *fele* is usually defined 'hide,' as though from ON. *fela*, and this meaning is possible here, if one takes *upon fote* with the following clause: 'If I fele me upon fote that I fle mozt' meaning 'If I conceal myself in order to flee on foot.' In spite of the following *vp*, I see no reason to make a special case of *herzed* (1179), by defining it 'ravaged as with a harrow' rather than 'harried, plundered' from *hergian* as in 1294, 1786. *Harrow*, noun and verb, apparently never appears with *z*-forms in ME. and the derivation from an OE. **hearge* is doubtful for other reasons. The forms of the verbs *lance*, *lauce* are difficult to disentangle; but though I may have been wrong in including the instance in 1428 under *lance* instead of *lauce*, it seems to me incorrect to include all these words under *lauce*, even 'uttered' of 668. *Norne* is probably to be asso-

² *Purity, Yale Studies in English*, LXI, New Haven, 1920.

ciated with Swed. dial, *norna*, *nyrna* 'inform secretly'; cf. Tolkien and Gordon's *Sir Gawain*. *Walle* in *walle-heued*, 'well-head' (364), correctly retained by the editor, is not from an OE. *weall*, but from OM. *walle*, variant of *welle*, WS. *wielle*, ME. *walle*-forms being characteristic of West Midland place-names, as Ekwall showed, *Contributions to the History of OE. Dialects*, p. 62. So the proper etymon of *malt*, inf. 'to melt,' is OM. *mæltan* (WS. *mieltan*). *Wasturne* (1674) is probably OM. *western*, ONth. *woestern*, modified by the influence of *wast*-forms from the French (so now NED.) *Rupe*, 'rouse, awaken,' which occurs also in *Gawain*, is now convincingly derived by Sundén (*Jespersen Grammatical Miscellany*, pp. 117 ff.) from ÓN. (*h*)*ryðja*, 'fling,' pret. *hruddi*, from the stem *hrud* or *hrud* 'to put in violent motion, shake, fling.' Sundén also proposes elaborate but more doubtful etymologies for the two verbs *rothele* 'to cook, boil,' and 'to hasten.'

ROBERT J. MENNER

Yale University

Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. By G. R. OWST. Cambridge: at the University Press, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933. Pp. xxiv + 616. \$8.00.

Dr. Owst has produced another volume to which, from one point of view, all students of the later Middle Ages will accord the same approbation which greeted his earlier book, *Preaching in Medieval England* (1926).

It is manifestly difficult in any review to handle justly a book packed as this one is with a multitude of interesting facts and quotations. In the first chapter Dr. Owst argues for the influence of the preachers on the re-emergence of English as a literary language (pp. 3-9), and describes their attitude toward the minstrels (pp. 10-23). He goes on to give a selection of realistic references to matters of everyday life from the sermons and preachers' source books, with many quotations from Bromyard's *Summa Predicantium* (pp. 24-40). Chapter II, "Scripture and Allegory," begins with a discussion of the four ways of interpreting the Scriptures—literal or historical, allegorical, tropological and anagogical (pp. 58 ff.). Certain favorite figures are treated at length: the Ship (pp. 68-76), which may be the Church, or the Good Man or the State,¹ and the Castle (pp. 77-86), which may be of God, of Man or of the Devil. The Vices and Virtues appear, and Dr. Owst argues that the allegories of Langland and Bunyan grew out of

¹ Dr. Owst seems to have overlooked the pretty use of the Ship in Gower's *Vox Clamantis*, bk. i, caps. 17 ff.

these sermon abstractions. Chapter III, "The Heavenly Host," deals with the treatment of Biblical personages and saints in the sermons. Dr. Owst quotes descriptions of devils (p. 112 f.), which "help also to maintain a popular belief in ghosts and fairies" (p. 113), changes and adaptations of Biblical stories which show "how living and real many incidents of Scripture must have seemed to ordinary folk in the Middle Ages" (p. 117), the familiar treatment of the saints (pp. 122 ff.), and the attitude toward images and relics (pp. 137-148). There is much that is new and interesting in Dr. Owst's fourth chapter, "Fiction and Instruction in the Sermon Exempla." A few of the more general categories distinguished here by Dr. Owst are worth nothing—local (pp. 157 ff.), historical (pp. 158-161) and humorous (pp. 162 ff.) stories; personal experiences of the preacher (pp. 169 ff.); classical stories (pp. 178 ff.), some including myths and marvels (pp. 186-188); the phenomena of Nature.

The heart of the book and in many ways the most valuable part consists of the three Chapters (v, vi, vii) on the "Preaching of Satire and Complaint." The first of these traces the rise of satire in English, and makes it clear that Dr. Owst feels that the early political and satirical songs owe their origin to sermon satire (pp. 225-228). The satire of Langland, Chaucer and Gower all show influence of the sermons (pp. 228-232). Dr. Owst emphasizes the fact, not perhaps as little known as he would suggest, that Lollards and later Reformers said nothing against corruption in the Church which had not already been said, and often more pointedly, by orthodox preachers (pp. 251 ff.). Chapter vi deals with satirical attacks on other classes of society than the clergy, and Dr. Owst points out that the orthodox were as aware of the social inequalities of the day as were the Lollards (p. 289). The preachers level their attacks on pride (pp. 307-314) and avarice (pp. 315-319), which are found in all branches of lay society. The higher (pp. 320-330) and lesser (pp. 331-338) nobility, the lawyers (pp. 338-349), the physicians (pp. 349-351), the merchants (pp. 352-361) and the laborers (pp. 361-370) are pilloried for a rare variety of vices. From the faults of the various classes we pass on, in Chapter VII, to the misdemeanors of individuals, and especial attention is given to women (pp. 376 ff.). Poor and rich, fair and foul, they are certain to cause "us sely men" trouble. Love-making is vile (pp. 382-385), women don't obey their husbands (pp. 389 f.), finery is wicked (pp. 390-404), and how awful are ladies' horns! Swearing is prevalent and abominable (pp. 414-425), people haunt taverns, and drink (pp. 425-441) and eat (pp. 441-449) too much. These pages serve as a lively commentary on the sermon of Chaucer's Pardoner. There are scandal-mongers everywhere (pp. 450-458), people yield readily to wrath (pp. 458-460), and children are disobedient (pp. 460-468).

The Eighth Chapter deals with the relations between the sermon and the early drama, which Dr. Owst believes to be very close indeed.² The final chapter, "A Literary Echo of the Social Gospel," discusses in detail what Dr. Owst has hinted at often before, namely, that *Piers Plowman* consists, in the main, of sermon material cast in another form.

The summary which has been given indicates clearly the importance of this volume. It does not, however, indicate certain defects in it which distress and often confound the reader. Arrangement and style are not always clear, and the footnotes, of which there are "over two thousand five hundred" (p. xviii) are frequently difficult to read or use. A list of the manuscript sources of which Dr. Owst makes use would have served as a helpful guide. Some readers may feel that they are reminded too often and too strenuously of the importance to the history of English literature of the material which Dr. Owst is presenting. Surely every scholar should feel enthusiasm for his own problem, but even so there may be too many statements such as this: "As scholars of the future awake to their importance, it is safe to say that a revolution will be effected in our knowledge of English letters, the like of which has not been seen since the days of Thomas Warton" (p. 55). This attitude leads Dr. Owst again and again to comment unfavorably upon scholars, living and dead, who had not been sufficiently enterprising to anticipate his work. Even if some of the strictures be deserved, most readers will be affected unpleasantly by a series of contemptuous and slighting references to other scholars. One example must suffice to illustrate this unfortunate tendency: "This fastidious connoisseur [W. P. Ker!] who so coolly despairs the current literature of religion because it is not to his liking" (p. 217).

Then, too, readers may not feel that the often puzzling question of literary influence is always treated in a judicial fashion. Dr. Owst's method is to claim all, and the extravagance of such a procedure serves to cast doubt upon what may be valid theories. We put down the book with the feeling that everything worth while in English literature may be traced to the sermons, and must be traced to them. Independent observation of common facts, independent recourse to authorities play no part whatever. Simple secular men-of-letters needed the model of vernacular sermons to inform them that poems in English would be better understood by an English speaking people than poems in French or Latin. Satire on women, as in the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*, is from the sermons—as if one of the most common of literary and human phenomena had to be re-inspired for the benefit of the later Middle

² Lack of space forbids any discussion of the points raised by Dr. Owst, but the reviewer finds himself in almost complete agreement with the full and competent treatment to be found in Professor G. R. Coffman's review in *Studies in Philology*, xxI (1934), 106-109.

Ages. Because some of the *exempla* are humorous Dr. Owst (pp. 166 ff.) finds in them the direct ancestors of the *facetiae*—as if the short, humorous and usually smutty story, as old and as shameless as humanity itself, required clerical incubation and fostering. Dr. Owst speaks of literary historians who “will glibly indicate a presumed indebtedness to earlier writers of the kind with whom they may happen to be familiar, repeatedly dragging in some remote analogue from continental literature to fill any gaps in their fanciful story” (p. 211). The implications of this statement require no comment. Later he says, in discussing the Wife of Bath, “As for the straying cat and its ‘senged skin’ to which Dame Alice refers, this also is a hoary commonplace of our pulpit” (p. 389). It may well be, but it is a commonplace of Chaucerian scholarship that Chaucer took this passage, as he took much more, directly from Deschamps’s *Miroir de Mariage* (ll. 3214 f.). Clearly, and this appears all too often, the only good parallels and analogues are Dr. Owst’s. Again, Dr. Owst objects to Professor Manly’s identifications of the Pilgrims in the *Canterbury Tales* (pp. 230, 370, 386), because, of course, the pilgrims are common sermon types but he himself proceeds with relish to identify characters in *Piers Plowman* with Bishop Brunton of Rochester and Peter de la Mare (pp. 578 ff.).

One cannot avoid the feeling that, in the state of our present knowledge, the facts in this volume are of more value than the theories, but, and there can be no hesitation about this, the volume is immeasurably more than worthwhile for the facts alone.

B. J. WHITING

Harvard University

Vom Wesen des Lautwandels. Von KASPER ROGGER. Leipzig-Paris: 1933. Pp. 182. (Leipziger Romanistische Studien herausgegeben von W. von Wartburg 1/6.)

Il s’agit d’un travail de débutant qui s’attaque aux plus ardues problèmes de la science phonétique. Et il me faut avouer que ce jeune a résolu plusieurs questions que les générations antérieures n’ont pas pu tirer au clair. Je crois que la raison de ce succès est un manque de “spécialisation” (au sens néfaste du mot), la largeur de vues d’un auteur qui, en dehors d’études linguistiques, en a faites sur le domaine de la philosophie, de la psychologie, des sciences naturelles: il n’a pas buté contre des pierres qu’avaient entassées les “spécialistes des lois phonétiques.”

Je relève les idées fondamentales suivantes dans l’opuscle: la réfutation de l’hypothèse de Schuchardt au sujet des “exceptions”

de la loi phonétique : l'auteur prouve que la loi phonétique ne peut pas avoir d'exceptions (bien entendu : au moment où et dans la communauté linguistique où elle est en vigueur), parce que la transformation phonétique atteint le système entier d'une langue et n'obéit pas à l'arbitraire, mais à la transformation de ce système, qui, elle, est dictée soit par des transformations psychiques de la communauté parlante, soit par le fait même qu'elle veut reproduire les sons traditionnels. Ici j'ai la grande joie de pouvoir indiquer la convergence d'un travail personnel (que l'auteur ne pouvait pas connaître) avec le sien : J'ai publié dans les *Mélanges Salverda de Grave* (1933) un article "Zum Warum der Lautentwicklung" qui arrive à cette même conclusion : comme dans le domaine de la sémantique il y a une surenchère constante parce qu'on veut conserver la même intensité et affectivité à une expression, de même on altère les sons parce qu'on veut les rendre d'une manière identique à celle qu'on a apprise ou entendue. On innove par esprit de conservation. On emploie trop de force pour atteindre un but jugé normal. Au fond, l'évolution des sens et des sons montre l'homme s'évertuant à rester le même et par là même échouant dans sa tâche : un conservateur qui à son insu devient révolutionnaire. Il y a donc une évolution des sons inhérente à la langue, permanente, nécessaire, conditionnée par le fait même de la parler. L'évolution des sons s'explique par l'emploi du langage humain, par l'être même de l'homme. Ceci est, ce me semble, un résultat qui peut donner à penser aux philosophes—and nous saluons avec joie le progrès que ce travail bien pensé et bien rédigé a fait faire à la linguistique générale.

LEO SPITZER

Université d'Istanbul

BRIEF MENTION

A Primer of Romance Philology. By FREDERICK ANDERSON. The Stanford University Press, 1934. 15 pp. In this pamphlet Professor Anderson of Stanford University gives a brief definition of phonetics, an outline map of language change, some facts relative to Vulgar Latin, a list of the Romance languages, notes on Romance orthography, some of the outstanding phonological changes in French, Spanish, Italian, and Provençal, an explanation of the terms syncope and apocope, and definitions of morphology, lexicology, and syntax. As not more than one or two pages can be devoted to each of these topics it will be seen that Mr. Anderson has had to spread out a vast amount of material and sift it very fine. A body of material so highly selective can seldom be used to advantage by any one save the author of the book. In his Fore-

word Mr. Anderson states the purpose of the manual: to introduce students to the literature and the main principles of Romance Philology. Unfortunately he does not include within this literature any of the recent writings by Lucien Foulet, Leo Spitzer, Carl Vossler, Giulio Bertoni, and others, who for some years now have been very active in the field. Mr. A.'s little book is introductory only to the fundamental grammars and as such it gives the appearance of having been written some twenty years ago. We should expect some discussion, at least, of the various linguistic atlases and of the importance of dialect studies. The material is quite accurate, as far as it goes. Some of us would debate the inclusion of Catalan as a dialect of Provençal, and of Sardinian as a dialect of Italian. On the change of *au* to *o* in Vulgar Latin the author might have used Racher's article in *Glotta* xvi (1928), 74-84. The book contains several references to Russian pronunciations which can hardly be useful to elementary students using this manual.

URBAN T. HOLMES

The University of North Carolina

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DATE OF CIPERIS DE VIGNEVAUX. In *MLN.*, XLIX, 559-561 a correspondent makes the rash and quite unwarranted statement that in writing my recent study on the date of *Ciperis de Vigneaux* (*MLN.*, XLIX, 255-260) I was unaware of a certain Hungarian doctor's dissertation, the work of Mr. Viktor Machovich, dealing with this poem and published in Hungary in 1928. The truth of the matter is that I knew both author and title of the compilation but *deliberately disregarded* it, no copy being available in Washington and Baltimore.

Coming now to the correspondent's objections, let me say at once that they are largely based upon a complete misunderstanding of my text. I have nowhere 'identified' the hero of the poem with Sigismund or any other king of Hungary. My thesis is concerned with no 'identification' of any sort, for I am absolutely convinced that *chansons de geste* never were *romans à clef*. What I do claim is simply that the political situation of contemporary Europe influenced the unknown author in shaping the purely exterior aspects of his plot (or some of them), incidentally furnishing a convenient *terminus a quo* for the dating of the poem. No one now accepts Claude Fauchet's tentative dating, and Paulin Paris expressed the utmost diffidence about a dating of *Ciperis de Vigneaux* on internal criteria—for obvious reasons.

As for the city of Moron(s), Prof. Alfons Hilka, in a communication of March 24, 1934, drew my attention to the occurrence of the same city under the name of *Magerone* (as the capital of Hungary) in *Florimont*. He

suggests that the name is possibly connected with *Madjar*, the national name of the Hungarians. As for the Dalmatian *Maronia*, it also occurs in *Florimont* as *Moriainz*, evidently in spite of the 'tremendous' distances which separate Hungary proper from the Dalmatian coast.¹ Since I have never claimed that the author of *Ciperis de Vigneaux* was a specialist in Hungarian geography, I fail to see how geographical blunders of his can defeat my thesis. To serious students *Boude* was known as the capital of Hungary long before Nicopolis, but as I have said, the unknown poet certainly did not belong to this class. Nor was he bound (as I have expressly stated in my article) to reproduce all the details of royal relationships by birth or marriage, even had he known them, for, I repeat, he wrote no *roman à clef*. As for other Hungarian kings related by marriage to Roman emperors before the Hapsburg era, they may safely be considered to have been as completely forgotten in fifteenth century France as they are to-day—save by professional historians and genealogists. The correspondent's remarks on the point are therefore singularly irrelevant.

It is claimed furthermore that there was no immediate danger threatening Hungary from the Turks when the French set out to aid Sigismund. The remark is cryptic: the danger threatening Hungary's very existence began when the Osmanli Turks defeated the Serbs at Kosovo polje in 1389; it ended with the heroic defense of Vienna by Rüdiger von Starhemberg in 1683. All crusades undertaken in the interim by Western and Central Europe had only one aim, to avert that danger. Sigismund's campaign had no other object.

I have nowhere claimed that the battle of Nicopolis was represented as a 'great national victory': the Europeans of the fifteenth century were not yet the expert 'propagandists' they are in the twentieth! Nor does the campaign in the poem reflect Sigismund's unlucky venture. Once more, *chansons de geste* are no *romans à clef*. The author places his poem moreover in Merovingian times! One may even conceivably argue that after the disaster he would console his readers by describing glorious victories of old, won in the same region (just as after 1870 the glories of the French Revolution and the First Empire were revived in France), the tacit understanding being, of course, that the wheel of Fortune might well turn once more! Besides, even the dating of the poem preferred by the correspondent (about 1350) would place its composition on the day after a terrible national disaster (Crécy, 1346). So his objection is pointless.

The last observation of the correspondent strikes me as sound: I do believe that had the poem been written after 1410, it probably would contain some reference to Philippe's elevation to the imperial throne. I am therefore inclined to regard 1410 rather than 1415 as its probable *terminus ante quem*.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE

Washington, D. C.

¹ In reality this 'tremendous' distance: Budapest-Spalato is not quite 250 miles!

REPLY. My only excuse for a "rash and quite unwarranted statement" in presuming that Professor Krappe was unaware of Machovich's thesis, is my taking for granted that contributors to a learned periodical would not "*deliberately disregard*" the work of a predecessor, especially if it is of capital importance to their subject. My innocence led me to believe that research was not confined to books available in Washington and vicinity, and that writers with claims to erudition feel obliged to devote a footnote to titles of works to which they had no access. At any rate, until the author of the attempted hypothesis carefully examines the thesis, which was briefly reviewed in *Revue des Etudes hongroises* XI (1933), 130, his counter-objections ought not in justice to be answered.

Still, his remarks contain too glaring misstatements to be overlooked. His approach to the problem is best characterized by his assertion that the Budapest-Spalato distance is "not quite 250 miles" when a simple check-up through the Information Bureau of the Hungarian Government in New York City would have furnished him with the official data according to which the distance is no less than 480 miles. He manifestly contradicts himself when averring in his article that the motifs of *Ciperis* "echo" the life and doings of a Hungarian king related to the German emperor, and claims in his counter-objections that no identification was intended. My "singularly irrelevant" remarks were meant to demonstrate that the fabulous Phillippe of the poem bears no single trait of any authentic king of Hungary. Family relationships of Hungarian royalty were less unknown in France than Professor Krappe imagines. Ten years before the battle of Nicopolis, Eustache Deschamps visited Hungary as member of a delegation whose mission was to attempt to conclude a marriage between a son of Charles VI of France and that very daughter of Louis the Great of Hungary whom Sigismund actually married (cf. G. Birkás' article, *Egyetemes Philologai Közlöny* XLII (1918), 361 ss.). The statement on the Turkish wars, too, is misleading. In 1683, the Turks were no longer "a danger threatening Hungary's very existence" as at least two-thirds of that country had been in the actual possession of the Turks for about a hundred years, Hungary's destiny having been sealed by the mournful debacle of Mohacs (1526). The reference to the battle of Crécy is pointless; *Ciperis* had clearly nothing to do with it. The argument as to the identity of Morons is irrelevant; I merely contended that it could not be identified with the actual capital of Hungary. I conclude by observing that calling four years' period "a day" is a daring hyperbole.

ARPAD STEINER

Hunter College

REJOINDER. The 'capital' importance of Machovich's compilation may be gauged from the fact (unknown, it seems, to the correspondent) that it has so far been ignored by every Romance periodical in the world. I also wonder whether the correspondent has ever heard of the exchange system of doctor's dissertations existing between most universities of good repute, i. e., if the dissertations are worth the exchange! My geographical knowl-

edge, like that of most mortals, is derived from the common atlas (Budapest-Spalato, not quite 500 kilometers as the crow flies), not from the 'Information' Bureau of a foreign government! I have nowhere claimed that *Ciperis* 'echoes' the life and doings of any Hungarian king: I expressly stated that *chansons de geste* are no *romans à clef*. Since the correspondent does not appear to know the implication of the latter term I believe it useless to labor the point further. It would be a mere waste of your valuable space to discuss the rest of the correspondent's remarks: the readers may safely be left to do them full justice.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE

Washington, D. C.

CHATEAUBRIAND, SHAW, and SANNAZARO. Dr. Chandler Beall points out in *MLN.*, XLVII (1932), 509-10, that a Latin quotation in the *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*, x, 159 (éd. Ladvocat), is from Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis*, II, 214-19, and suggests that Chateaubriand owed his knowledge of it to an annotated edition of *Jerusalem Delivered*. The latter hypothesis, which B. restates in his valuable investigation, *Chateaubriand et le Tasse* (Baltimore, 1934, p. 70), is unlikely, as Chateaubriand admits (*Itinéraire*, x, 2) that he had dispensed with reading *Jerusalem Delivered* in the original, and as I am reasonably certain, after a careful comparison of texts, that he utilized for the French quotations Lebrun's translation (Paris, 1774), and for the Italian citations that of Panckoucke-Framéry (Paris, 1785). It is much more probable that Chateaubriand owed the Sannazaro reference to the *Voyages de Monsieur Shaw, M. D. dans plusieurs provinces de la Barbarie et du Levant . . .* (La Haye, Jean Neaulme, 1743), from which he gleaned passage after passage, and which reproduces from Sannazaro exactly the six lines (I, 191) in question. B. also indicates in his article that Tasso imitates Sannazaro in the famous lines of the *Gerusalemme liberata*:

Giace l'alta Cartago; a pena i segni
De lalte sue rüine il lido serba, etc.

and concludes that this stanza "may have conditioned Chateaubriand's manner of perceiving the 'ruines si peu apparentes que je les distinguois à peine du sol.'" Undoubtedly Chateaubriand knew his *Jerusalem Delivered*, but, had his memory failed him, Shaw again would have reminded him of the picture of ruins with his quotation, in a footnote on the opposite page (I, 190), of these very lines of Tasso. It seems then reasonable to suppose that it was Shaw who brought to Chateaubriand's attention the quotations from these two Italians.

EMILE MALAKIS

University of Pennsylvania

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The English list includes only books received.]

Armour, R. W.—Barry Cornwall. *Boston*: Meador, 1935. Pp. 370. \$3.00.

Bäck, Hilding.—Synonyms for "child," "boy," "girl" in Old English. *Lund*: H. Ohlsson, 1934. Pp. xvi + 273. (Lund Studies in Eng., 2.)

Bütow, Hans.—Altenglische "Traumgesicht vom Kreuz." *Heidelberg*: Carl Winters, 1935. Pp. viii + 185. (Anglistische Forschungen, 78.)

Clyde, William M.—Struggle for the freedom of the press from Caxton to Cromwell. *London* [and *New York*]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. xvi + 360. \$4.25.

England's Helicon, 1600, 1614.—Edited by Hyder E. Rollins. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard U. Press, 1935. 2 vols. Pp. xiv + 228; viii + 241. \$6.00.

Fettig, Adolf.—Gradadverbien im Mittelenglischen. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winters, 1934. Pp. viii + 222. (Anglistische Forschungen, 79.)

Grabo, Carl.—Meaning of "The Witch of Atlas." *Chapel Hill*: U. of N. Carolina Press, 1935. Pp. x + 158. \$2.50.

Halline, A. G. (ed.).—American plays. *New York*: American Book Co., 1935. Pp. viii + 787.

Hardy, Thomas.—An indiscretion in the life of an heiress. Edited by Carl J. Weber. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. viii + 146. \$2.00.

Joliat, Eugène.—Smollett et la France. *Paris*: H. Champion, 1935. Pp. 279. (Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, 105.)

Kahn, Ludwig W.—Shakespeares sonette in Deutschland. *Bern*: Gotthelf, 1935. Pp. 122.

Kelchner, G. D.—Dreams in Old Norse literature and their affinities in folklore. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1935. Pp. 154. \$3.50.

Macbeth, Gilbert.—John Gibson Lockhart, a critical study. *Urbana, Illinois*: U. of Illinois Press, 1935. Pp. 229. \$2.25. (Illinois Studies in Lang. and Lit., XVII, 3-4.)

Martin, Roger.—Chronologie de la vie et de l'œuvre de Thomas Gray. *London* [and *New York*]: Oxford U. Press, 1935. Pp. 199. \$1.25.

Martin, Roger.—Essai sur Thomas Gray. *London* [and *New York*]: Oxford U. Press, 1934. Pp. x + 460. \$5.00.

Mayo, T. F.—Epicurus in England, 1650-1725. *Dallas*: Southwest Press, 1934. Pp. xxviii + 237. \$4.00.

Morgan, William T.—Bibliography of British history (1700-1715). Vol. 1 (1700-1707). *Bloomington, Indiana*: Indiana U. Press, 1934. Pp. xviii + 524.

Sharpe, R. B.—The real war of the theaters. *Boston*: Heath, 1935. Pp. viii + 260. \$2.50. (MLA Monographs, 5.)

Sheridan, R. B.—The rivals. Edited by Richard L. Purdy. *Oxford* [and *New York*]: Oxford U. Press, 1935. Pp. lii + 122. \$7.50.

Spens, Janet.—Spenser's Faerie Queene. *London*: E. Arnold [*New York*: Longmans, Green], 1935. Pp. 144. \$3.40.

Sterne, Laurence.—Letters. Edited by L. P. Curtis. *Oxford* [and *New York*]: Clarendon Press, 1935. Pp. xxxiv + 495. \$12.00.

Tenney, E. A.—Thomas Lodge. *Ithaca, New York*: Cornell U. Press, 1935. Pp. xiv + 202. \$2.00. (Cornell Studies in Eng., XXVI.)

Wilson, John.—The cheats. Edited by M. C. Nahm. *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1935. Pp. x + 280. 10 s. 6 d.

GERMAN

Arend, Maria.—Die Personennamen des Friedberger Urkundenbuches. 1. Bd., 1216-1410. Diss. Bonn. *Bottrop i. W.*: Postberg, 1934. ix, 146 pp.

Borchling, Conrad.—Plattdeutsche Rechtschreibungslehre für die Mundarten des nordniedersächsischen Raumes. Nebst einem Wörterverzeichnis von Dr. Walther Niekerken. *Hamburg*: K. Wachholtz, 1935. 57 pp. M. 1.

Brückner, Wilhelm.—Ein ostmitteldeutsches Psalterfragment. Diss. *Breslau*: Breslauer Genossenschafts-Buchdruckerei, 1934. 79 pp.

Castle, Eduard.—Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung in Österreich-Ungarn . . . nach dem Tode von Joh. Willibald Nagl und Jakob Zeidler hrsg. 3. (Schluß-) Bd. 1848-1918. 12. Abt. Wien: Carl Fromme, 1935. Pp. 1753-1912. M. 8.40.

Deneke, Otto.—Robinson Crusoe in Deutschland. Die Frühdrucke 1720-1780. [Göttingische Nebenstunden, 11]. *Göttingen*: 1934. 38 pp. M. 2.

Deubel, Werner.—Der deutsche Weg zur Tragödie. *Dresden*: Jess [1935]. 80 pp. M. 2.

Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien. Hrsg. vom Deutschen Volksliedarchiv. 1. Bd.: Deutsche Volkslieder. Balladen, Unter Mithilfe von Harry Schewe u. Erich Seemann gemeinsam mit Wilh. Heiske u. Fred

Quellmalz hrsg. von John Meier. 1. Bd. 1. Tl. Berlin: de Gruyter & Co., 1935. iv, 196 pp. 4°. M. 8.

Dexel, Wolfram.—Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Stifterschen Novellenkunst in den "Studien." [Diss. München, 1931. Teildruck]. Kallmünz: Laßleben, 1934. ix, 83 pp.

Dreyer, Alfred.—Johann Matthias Dreyer, 1717-1769. Ein Hamburger satirischer Dichter und Holstein-Gottorper Diplomat. Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte Hamburgs um die Mitte des 18. Jh. [Veröffentlichungen des Vereins für Hamburg. Geschichte. Bd. 8]. Hamburg: Christians, 1934. 154 pp. M. 4.50.

Eberth, Friedrich.—Die Minne- und Meistergesangweisen der Kolmarer Liederhandschrift. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der deutschen Liedweise im 14. bis 18. Jh. Detmold: E. Schnelle, 1935. 114 pp. M. 4.

Ehrismann, Gustav.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. Tl. 2: Die mhd. Literatur. Schlüsfband. [Handbuch des deutschen Unterrichts an höheren Schulen. Bd. 6, Tl. 2]. München: C. H. Beck, 1935. xviii, 699 pp., 4°. M. 21.

Freies Deutsches Hochstift.—Ansprachen gehalten am 10. und 11. November 1934 zur Feier des fünfundseitigjährigen Bestehens des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts und zum hundertfünfundseitigsten Geburtstage Schillers. Im Auftrag der Verwaltung hrsg. von Ernst Beutler. Halle: Niemeyer, 1935. 49 pp. Large 8°.

Goetz, Sister Mary Paul, O. S. B.—The Concept of Nobility in German Didactic Literature of the 13th Century. Diss. [Catholic Univ. of America, Studies in German, Vol. V]. Washington, D. C.: 1935. viii, 138 pp.

Gottschalk, Albert.—Heinrich Heine. Der Doktor Faust. Ein Tanzpoem nebst kuriosen Berichten über Taufel, Hexen und Dichtkunst. Eine Bibliographie. Als Hs. gedruckt. Berlin: 1934. 31 pp. 4°.

Grimm, Jacob u. Wilhelm.—Briefwechsel der Brüder Grimm mit Friedrich Zarncke. Hrsg. u. erl. von Alb. Leitzmann [S.-A. aus Sitzungsberichte d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1935, 28]. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1934. 54 pp. 4°. M. 3.50.

Haller, Rudolf.—Der wilde Alexander. Beiträge zur Dichtungsgeschichte des 13. Jh. [Diss. Bonn]. Würzburg: Trittsch, 1935. 128 pp. M. 3.

Heinisch, Klaus J.—Antike Bildungslemente im frühen deutschen Minnesang. Diss. Bonn. Neustadt, Oberschl.: 1934. 156 pp.

Leopold, Werner.—Reise durch Deutschland. A Cultural First Reader. Boston:

D. C. Heath & Co. [1935]. xxii, 283 pp. \$1.60.

Maskow, Erika.—Theodor Schwarz. Ein pommerischer Romantiker. [Pommernforschung. Reihe 3, H. 1]. Greifswald: Bamberg, 1934. 111 pp. M. 3.

Mertens, Käthe.—Die Konstanzer Minnelehre. [Germanische Studien. H. 159]. Berlin: Ebering, 1935. 115 pp. M. 4.50.

Hoffmann, K. E.—Das Leben des Dichters Heinrich Leuthold. Gedichte, Aufsätze, Aussprüche u. Briefe (von und über Leuthold). [S.-A. aus Neujahrsblatt der Lesegeellschaft Wädenswil, 1935]. 91 pp., 8 plates. M. 4.

Morawetz, Hanns.—A. von Witzleben (A. von Tromlitz). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historischen Romans und der Unterhaltungsliteratur in Deutschland. Diss. Breslau: 1934. 81 pp.

Paulsen, Wolfgang.—Expressionismus und Aktivismus. Eine typologische Untersuchung. Bern, Leipzig: Gotthelf Verlag, 1935. 240 pp. Fr. 8.

Rawolle, Erich.—Mundart und Kolonisation in der Sächsisch-Böhmischem Schweiz. [Mitteldeutsche Studien, H. 8 = Teuthonista. Beiheft 11]. Halle: Niemeyer, 1934. 68 pp. 23 plates. M. 4.80.

Römer, Friedrich.—Varnhagen von Ense als Romantiker. Diss. Berlin. Köln: May, 1934. 181 typewritten pp.

Schmidt, Werner.—"Penthesilea" in der Kleistliteratur [Von deutscher Poeterey. Bd. 16]. Diss. Leipzig: J. J. Weber, 1934. 69 pp. M. 2.80.

Thimme, Adolf.—Georg Wigand und die Musenklänge aus Deutschlands Leierkasten. Bibliophile Bemühungen um literarische Kleinigkeiten. Ein Kommentar zu einer Neuausgabe der Musenklänge. [Göttingische Nebenstudien. 12]. Göttingen: 1935. 39 pp. M. 2.

Unger, Elise.—Die Stellung der Frau bei Stifter. Diss. Teildruck, Berlin. Jena: Neuenhahn, 1934. 58 pp.

Volk, Winfried.—Die Entdeckung Tahitis und das Wunschbild der seligen Insel in der deutschen Literatur. Diss. Heidelberg: Kranz & Heinrichmüller, 1934. viii, 160 pp.

Weckmüller, Artur.—Heines Stil. [Sprache u. Kultur d. german. u. roman. Völker. B, Bd. 11]. Breslau: Priebatsch, 1934. vii, 125 pp. M. 6.

Westphal, Elisabeth.—Flurnamen und Kulturreiseforschung. Diss. Bonn: Ludwig, 1934. 55 pp. 4°.

FRENCH

Aurenche, L.—J.-J. Rousseau chez M. de Mably. Paris: Malfière, 1934. 160 pp. Fr. 15.

- Balzac.** — Corresp. inédite avec Mme Z. Carrraud. *Paris*: Colin, 1935. 352 pp. Fr. 25.
 — Eugénie Grandet, éd. F. Guirand. 2 t. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 96 + 112 pp.
 — Père Goriot, éd. J. Boudout. 2 t. *Ibid.*, 1934. 100 + 108 pp.
Beaumarchais. — Barbier de Séville, éd. P. Richard. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 104 pp.
 — Mariage de Figaro, éd. P. Richard. 2 t. *Ibid.*, 1934. 102 + 84 pp.
Boeniger, Y. — Lamartine et le sentiment de la nature. *Paris*: Nizet et Bastard, 1934. ix + 287 pp. Fr. 35.
Bossuet. — Oraisons funèbres, éd. J.-R. Charbonnel. 2 t. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 96 + 104 pp.
 Catalogue des livres impr. de la Bibl. nationale. T. 127. Olivier-Ossat. *Paris*: Impr. nat., 1934. 1148 cols.
Chateaubriand. — Atala, René. Les Natchez (extraits). Ed. Th. Delarouzee. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 104 pp.
Diderot. — Œuvres choisies, éd. J. Voilquin. 2 t. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 96 + 100 pp.
Evans, Serge. — Leur jeunesse. Michelet, Renan, Taine. *Paris*: Rev. mod. des arts et de la vie, 1934. 165 pp. Fr. 12.
Fay, E. G. — Outline of Fr. lit. with reading refs. to cheap Fr. eds. and Eng. trans. *Ithaca*: Thrift Press, 1935. 18 pp.
Fénelon. — Lettre à l'Académie, éd. M. Roux. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 92 pp.
Gillot, H. — La pensée de J.-J. Rousseau. *Paris*: Courvile, 1935. 184 pp. Fr. 18.
Huguet, E. — L'évolution du sens des mots depuis le XVI^e s. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 350 pp. Fr. 30.
Janssen, H. — Montaigne fidéiste. *Paris*: Nizet et Bastard, 1934. 107 pp. Fr. 50.
Jourda, P. — Stendhal. L'homme et l'œuvre. *Paris*: Desclée, de Brouwer, 1935. 296 pp. Fr. 20.
La Bruyère. — Les Caractères (Extraits), éd. R. Ternois. 2 t. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 96 + 108 pp.
La Fontaine. — Fables choisies, éd. A. Cart et Mme Roussel. 2 t. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 108 + 108 pp.
Lamartine. — Harmonies. Méditations. Ed. H. Maugis. 2 t. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 108 + 108 pp.
Lefèvre, R. — La vie inquiète de P. Loti. *Paris*: Malfière, 1934. 256 pp. Fr. 15.
Loti, Pierre. — Pêcheur d'Islande, ed. D. S. Blondheim. *New York*: Macmillan, 1935. xviii + 206 pp. \$0.90.
Marivaux. — Le Jeu de l'amour et du hasard, éd. A. Cart et Mlle G. Labarère. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 108 pp.
Montesquieu. — Pages choisies, éd. C.-A. Fusil. 2 t. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 104 + 84 pp.
Parmly, Ruth. — The geographical references in the Chanson de Garin de Loherain. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1935. 90 pp. \$1.25.
Pascal. — Les Provinciales (extraits), éd. P. Clarac. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 88 pp.
Pauphilet, A. — Chrestien de Troyes. Le Ms. d'Annonay. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 75 pp. Fr. 40.
Pérouse, G. — Causeries sur l'hist. litt. de la Savoie. 2 t. *Paris*: Dardel, 1934. xii + 354 + 314 pp. Fr. 50.
Premsela, M. J. — E. Rostand. Diss. *Amsterdam*: 1933. xiv + 321 pp.
Rabelais. — L'Abbaye de Thélème, éd. crit. de R. Morçay. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 71 pp.
 — The five bks. and minor writings, with letters and documents, trans. W. F. Smith. 2 ed., vol. I, prepared by D. H. Beves. *Cambridge*: Univ. Press, N. Y.: Macmillan, 1934. elxxiv + 284 pp. \$4.25.
Sévigné. — Lettres choisies, éd. E. Feuilletare. *Paris*: Larousse, 1934. 108 pp.
Wickelgren, Fl.-L. — La Mothe Le Vayer. Sa vie, son œuvre. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 286 pp. Fr. 40.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio. — Saul. Con introduzione e commento di G. Marzot. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1934. viii + 101 pp. L. 4.

— Virginia. Tragedia in cinque atti. Con introduzione, argomenti, considerazioni e note a cura di G. Bonfiglioli. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1934. 121 pp. L. 2.75. (Collana di cultura classica.)

Antonini, A. — Il figlio d'un Cortonese e Pinocchio; 1883-1933. *Cortona*: Tip. Sociale, 1933. 23 pp.

Ariosto, Lodovico, poeta e commissario in Garfagnana nel quarto centenario dalla morte. A cura di G. Fusai. *Miscellanea. Arezzo*: Tip. E. Zelli, 1933. xiv + 165 pp. L. 25.

Azzeruoli, Elvira. — Un po' di folklorismo paesano, coi sunti scolastici della storia e geografia di Sansevero, tratti dalle storie cittadine di A. Lucchino, M. Fraccacreta, ecc. *Napoli*: Joele e Aliberti, 1934. 160 pp. L. 8.

Bargellini, P. — Giosuè Carducci. *Brescia*: Morcelliana, 1934. 375 pp. L. 12.

Bassi, Ottavia. — Fra classicismo e romanticismo. Ippolito Pindemonte. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1934. 232 pp. L. 15.

Bernini, F., e Bianchi, L. — Antologia della lirica moderna, con elementi di ritmica e metrica per le scuole medie. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1934. 350 pp. L. 10.

- Bertoni, G.—Ludovico Ariosto. Discorso. *Roma*: R. Accademia d'Italia, 1933. 15 pp. L. 5. (R. Accademia d'Italia. Celebrazioni e commemorazioni, 11.)
- Bonghi, Ruggero.—Discorsi parlamentari. A cura di G. Gentile. *Milano*: A. Mondadori, 1934. xi + 515 pp. L. 30. (Opere di Ruggero Bonghi, II.)
- Bruno, Giordano.—Della causa principio e uno. Con introduzione di A. Aliotta. *Napoli*: F. Perrella, 1934. Pp. 159-259. L. 5. ("Semina flammae": classici del pensiero, Vol. II, parte I.)
- Calderaro, F.—Vita vissuta. Corso di storia per i licei e gli istituti magistrali, ricostruita attraverso documenti ed interpretazioni dei maggiori poeti e prosatori. Vol. II. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1934. 481 pp. L. 14. (Collezione scolastica "La nuova Italia.")
- Capozzi, S.—Vetustissima carmina. Il salterio degli studenti. *Roma*: P. Maglione, 1934. 274 pp.
- Carli, P., e Sainati, A.—La letteratura italiana dalle origini ai giorni nostri. Manuale per gli istituti tecnici di ogni tipo. Vol. II: Il quattrocento e il cinquecento. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1934. 530 pp. L. 14.
- Cataldo, A.—Il Ruzzante: Angelo Beolco. *Milano*: L. F. Cogliati, 1933. 151 pp. L. 10.
- Cavallari, M.—Tre giorni con Virgilio Brocchi. Prefazione del grande romanziere. *Padova*: R. Zannoni, 1934. 176 pp. L. 8.
- Consiglio, A.—Umanità di Leopardi. Vera istoria del sodalizio (Ranieri-Leopardi), con giunta alla derrata per —. *Roma*: S. A. poligr. italiana, 1934. 77 pp. L. 4.
- Crocioni, G.—La poesia dialettale marchigiana. Vol. I: Saggio storico critico con biobibliografia e con testi dialettali sino a tutto il secolo XVIII. *Fabriano*: Tip. Gentile, 1934. vii + 212 + 6 pp. L. 12. (Repr. fr. the "Rendiconti dell'Istituto marchigiano di scienze, lettere ed arti," VII-VIII, 1931-32.)
- D'Angelo, P.—L'amor di patria nella poesia di Giacomo Leopardi. *Catania*: Studio edit. moderno, 1934. 30 pp.
- De Donno, A.—Ingresso al "900." Viaggio ideologico nella letteratura contemporanea. *Roma*: Pinciana, 1934. xx + 223 pp. L. 10.
- Flori, E.—Soggiorni e villeggiature manzoniane. Con 100 illustrazioni intercalate nel testo. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1934. 359 pp. L. 25.
- Foschini, A.—Saggi vari. La multiforme figura di S. Francesco di Assisi. La crisi di coscienza dell'Innominato. Niccolò Machiavelli e Cesare Borgia. *Napoli*: V. Alferi, 1934. 143 pp. L. 7.
- Fubini, M.—Studi sulla critica letteraria nel settecento. *Firenze*: "Civiltà moderna," 1934. 102 pp. L. 8. (Quaderni di critica, 1.)
- Fusco, Maria.—L'opera di Giovanni Verga. *Catania*: Studio edit. moderno, 1934. 253 pp. L. 10.
- Galdenzi, F.—Il verace senso dell'"Orlando" di messer Ludovico Ariosto. *Avelino*: Tip. Pergola, 1934. 39 pp. L. 5.
- Giuliano, B.—La poesia di Giovanni Pascoli. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1934. 162 pp. L. 12.
- Giusti, Giuseppe.—Epistolario. *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1934. 694 pp. L. 5. (I classici. Edizione Florentia, n. 100.)
- Prose e poesie, scelte ed annotate da M. Brunetti. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1934. 164 pp. L. 7.
- Prose e poesie, scelte ed annotate da A. Ottolini ad uso delle scuole medie. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1934. 111 pp. L. 4.
- Goldoni, Carlo.—I rusteghi. Commedia in tre atti. Con introduzione e commento a cura di G. Bottoni. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1934. 70 pp. L. 3.
- I rusteghi. Con un saggio sull'arte del Goldoni e il commento di M. Dazzi. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1934. xlvi + 102 pp. L. 4. (I capolavori di C. Goldoni, I.)
- Il cavaliere e la dama. Con introduzione e note di A. De Vico. *Napoli*: A. Rondinella, 1935. 133 pp. L. 4.
- La bottega del caffè. Commedia in tre atti. Con introduzione e note di A. Avancini. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1934. 155 pp. (Collana di cultura classica.)
- Gustarelli, A.—Tracce di temi e analisi per i licei classici e scientifici. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1934. 130 pp. L. 5.
- Iezzi, G.—Il poeta Michele Bucceroni di Guardiagrele. *Guardiagrele*: Tip. A. G. Palmerio, 1933. 250 pp. L. 10.
- La Morgia, D.—Alfredo Oriani e il suo ideale. Conferenza. *Lanciano*: Tip. Carosella e Valerio, 1934. 15 pp.
- La Sorsa, S.—Tradizioni popolari pugliesi. Sezione 1a: Canti d'amore. Vol. 2a. *Bari-Roma*: F. Casini e figlio, 1934. 296 pp. L. 12.
- Leonetti, P.—Poesie del Novecento. Dal futurismo alla "maniera oscura." *Napoli-Roma*: "Seal," Società ediz. "Aspetti letterari," 1934. 71 pp. L. 5.
- Leopardi, Giacomo.—Epistolario. Nuova edizione ampliata con lettere dei corrispondenti e con note illustrate, a cura di F. Moroncini. Volume primo. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1934. xxvii + 325 pp. L. 25.
- Lupi, D.—Scrittori e poeti. Conferenze. Prefazione di V. Chianini. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1934. 233 pp. L. 10.

- Machiavelli, Niccolò.**—Il principe. Introduzione e commento di P. Treves. *Napoli*: A. Rondinella, 1934. 170 pp. L. 5.
- Manzoni, Alessandro.**—Adelchi. Tragedia annotata e illustrata da R. Garzia. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1933. xii + 133 pp. L. 7. (Biblioteca scolastica di classici italiani.)
- Marotta, Clorinda.**—Saggio su alcune traduzioni italiane delle Georgiche di Virgilio. *Palermo*: Tip. S. Pezzino e figlio, 1934. viii + 97 pp. L. 12.
- Meozzi, A.**—Il petrarchismo europeo (secolo XVI). Parte prima. *Pisa*: Vallerini, 1934. eviii + 326 pp. L. 25.
- Metastasio, Pietro.**—Melodrammi. *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1934. 2 vols., 581, 647 pp. L. 5 each volume. (I classici. Edizione Florentia, 58-59.)
- Opere scelte: melodrammi, oratori, cantate, canzonette. Introduzione e note di G. Natali. *Milano*: F. Vallardi, 1934. lxii + 335 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca di classici italiani annotati.)
- Miceli, L.**—Armi ed amori. Episodi di vita napoletana. Con prefazione di F. Dell'Erba. *Napoli*: Edit. Napoletana, 1934. 205 pp. L. 10.
- Momigliano, A.**—Dalle origini al novecento. Antologia della letteratura italiana ad uso degli istituti d'istruzione tecnica. Vol. II. *Messina-Milano*: G. Principato, 1934. 365 pp. L. 12.
- Storia della letteratura italiana. Vol. II: Dal Tasso all'Alfieri. *Messina*: G. Principato, 1934. 209 pp. L. 7.
- Nievo, Ippolito.**—Le confessioni di un ottuagenario (Le confessioni di un italiano). Studio, riduzione e commento a cura di Isabella Stagni. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1934. 397 pp. L. 10.
- Nulli, S. A.**—Il duecento. Antologia di poesie e di prose degli scrittori del secolo XIII, a cura di —. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1934. 246 pp. L. 8. (Edizioni Mondadori per le scuole medie.)
- Panzini, A.**—Guida alla grammatica italiana, con un prontuario delle incertezze. Libretto utile per ogni persona. 2a edizione ampliata. *Firenze*: R. Bemporad e figlio, 1934. 105 pp. L. 5.
- Parigi, L.**—Dante dov' è? *Milano*: F. Perrella e C., 1934. 35 pp. L. 3.
- Pedrina, F.**—Storia ed antologia della letteratura italiana. Per gli istituti tecnici superiori industriali, commerciali, agrari, per geometri, nautici. Vol. I: Dalle origini ai grandi del Trecento. *Milano*: L. Trevisini, 1934. 463 pp. L. 13.50.
- Pellico, Silvio.**—Le mie prigioni. Con introduzione e note di G. Paladino. *Napoli*: L. Loffredo, 1934. 244 pp. L. 6.
- Policastro, G.**—Alfredo Oriani, la vita e le opere. Prefazione di F. Ciarlantini. *Catania*: Studio edit. moderno, 1934. viii + 163 pp. L. 7.
- Prati, Giovanni**, nel cinquantenario della morte. A cura del r. liceo ginnasio Giovanni Prati, dell'Istituto fascista di cultura di Trento e dell'Associazione fascista della scuola. *Trento*: Tip. A. Scotoni, 1934. 135 pp. L. 5.
- Praz, M.**—Studi sul concettismo. *Milano*: "La cultura," 1934. viii + 168 pp. L. 25.
- Reichenbach, G.**—Studi sulle Operette morali di Giacomo Leopardi. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1934. 225 pp. L. 10. (Collana critica.)
- Rivelli, F., e Prosperi, F.**—Novelle scelte dal XIII al XX secolo. Con presentazione, note e commento di —. *Roma*: Albrighti, Segati e C., 1934. xi + 516 pp. L. 12.50.
- Roedel, R.**—Note manzoniane. *Torino*: Chiantore, 1934. 4to., 284 pp. L. 18.
- Romagnoli, E.**—Ariosto. Discorso. *Roma*: R. Accademia d'Italia, 1933. 29 pp. L. 5. (Reale Accademia d'Italia. Celebrazioni e commemorazioni, 12.)
- Discorsi critici. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1934. 250 pp. L. 12.
- Sarpi, Paolo.**—Pagine scelte. Con introduzione e note di P. Treves. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1934. 141 pp. L. 5. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, n. 50.)
- Savonarola, Gerolamo.**—Scritti di —; 1452-1498. A cura di F. Piggiali. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1934. 116 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)
- Sborselli, G.**—Tendenze e valori della nuova letteratura italiana. Discorso. *Portici*: Tip. Bellavista, 1933. 30 pp.
- Scarpa, A.**—Il romanticismo veneto e Girolamo Luigi Fattorini. *Venezia*: Libreria emiliana editrice, 1934. 53 pp. L. 2.
- Serra, N.**—Ritorni letterari e sentimentali. *Napoli*: Ediz. de "La Toga," 1934. 344 pp. L. 10.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe.**—Lettere dall'Italia sull'Italia. Milano. Firenze, Ferrara, Roma, Napoli, Ravenna, Venezia. Scelte e annotate da C. Zacchetti, con introduzione sulla vita e le opere del poeta. *Napoli*: Edit. Napoletana, 1934. 67 pp. L. 5.
- Studi danteschi** diretti da M. Barbi. Vol. XVIII. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1934. 222 pp. L. 15.
- Tasso, Torquato.**—Lettere autobiografiche. A cura di A. Tortoreto. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1934. 104 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca di letteratura, n. 81-82.)
- Tilgher, A.**—Studi di poetica. *Roma*: Libreria di scienze e lettere, 1934. 282 pp. L. 12.

Trabalza, C., e Allodoli, E.—*La grammatica degli italiani*. Firenze: F. Le Monnier, 1933. xi + 341 pp. L. 15.

Venditti, M.—*Sosta innanzi a Leopardi*. Lanciano: G. Carabba, 1934. 61 pp. L. 3.

Vespasiano da Bisticci.—*Vite di portoghesi illustri*. Ardit, P.—*Viaggio all'isola di Madera e alle Azzorre* (1567). Firenze: Tip. Alfani e Venturi, 1934. x + 39 pp. (Documentos para o estudo das relações culturais entre Portugal e Italia publicados por H. T. Coelho e G. Battelli, II.)

Visentini, Olga.—*Letteratura infantile dell'Italia nuova*. Conferenza. Milano: Ceschina, 1934. 52 pp. L. 2.

Vitali, G.—Giovanni Prati. Notizie biografiche. La poesia del Prati. Milano: A. Vallardi, 1934. 75 pp. L. 3. (Quaderni di analisi estetica.)

SPANISH

Arias, A.—*El cristal indígena*. Quito: Edit. América, 1934. [Biografía de F. E. J. de Santa Cruz y Espejo, 1740-1796.]

Basanta de la Riva, A.—*Catálogo genealógico de Vizcainas*. 2 vols. Madrid: Tip. de Archivos, 1934. 262 y 209 pp.

Carbia, R. D.—*La crónica oficial de las Indias Occidentales*. Estudio . . . acerca de la historiografía mayor de Hispano-América en los siglos XVI a XVIII. La Plata: Facultad de Humanidades, 1934. 303 pp.

Cervantes.—*El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha*, imp. por Juan de la Cuesta. Ed. facsimil. 2 vols. San Sebastián: Biblioteca Nueva, 1934. 13 + 316 + 4 hojas y 9 + 280 + 9 hojas.

Cotarelo Villedor, A.—*El P. José de Zaragoza y la Astronomía de su tiempo*. Madrid: Gráfica Universal, 1935. 163 pp.

Darío, R.—Obras desconocidas, escritas en Chile y no recopiladas en ninguno de sus libros. Ed. recogida por R. Silva Castro y precedida de un Estudio. Santiago de Chile: Univ. de Chile, 1934. exxxii + 318 pp.

Dobles Segreda, L.—*Índice bibliográfico de Costa Rica. Historia desde 1900 hasta 1933. San José de Costa Rica*: Lehman & Cía., 1934. xxvii + 778 pp. [Tomo VI.]

Donoso, R.—A. J. de Irisarri, escritor y diplomático [1786-1868]. Santiago de Chile: Prensas de la Universidad, 1934. 317 pp.

Estudio sobre la ciencia española del siglo XVII, pról. de N. Alcalá Zamora. Madrid: Gráfica Universal, 1935. xiv + 669 pp.

Fiora Kelly, A.—*Cronología de las óperas, dramas, líricos, oratorios, himnos, etc., cantados en Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: Ed. del autor, 1934. 83 pp.

Forgione, J. D.—*Nuestro idioma*. Buenos Aires, 1934. 305 pp.

García Mercadal, J.—*Estudiantes, sopistas y pícaros*. Madrid: Edit. Plutarco, 1934. 271 pp.

Géigel y Zenón, J. y A. Morales Ferrer.—*Bibliografía puertorriqueña*, escrita en 1894. Publica esta primera ed. F. J. Géigel y Sabat. Barcelona: Talls. Gráf. Garofé, 1934. 453 pp.

Herrera, A. de.—*Historia general de los hechos de los castellanos en las islas y Tierra firme del mar Océano*. Tomo I. Prólogo y notas de A. Ballesteros-Beretta. Madrid: Academia de la Historia, 1934. lxxxviii + 274 pp.

Marañón, G.—*Ensayo biológico sobre Enriqueta IV de Castilla y su Tiempo*. 2^a ed. aumentada. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1934. 216 pp.

Montoto, S.—*Lope de Vega y don Juan de Arguijo*. Sevilla: Imp. del Arenal, 1935. 30 pp.

Moreto, A.—*El desdén con el desdén*. Ed. by W. K. Jones. New York: Holt, 1935. xxxvii + 136 + xxxi pp. \$1.00.

Onís, F. de.—*Antología de la poesía española e hispano americana (1882-1932)*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1934. xxxv + 1212 pp. 27 ptas. (Publicaciones de la R. F. E.)

Otero D'Acosta, E.—*Historietas (Leyendas y tradiciones colombianas)*. Manizales, Colombia: Edit. Arturo Zapata, 1934. 220 pp. 1 peso.

Palcos, A.—*El "Facundo"* [de Sarmiento]. Buenos Aires: Edit. "El Ateneo," 1934.

Rivero, C. del.—*Historia de la Imprenta en Madrid*. Madrid: Artes Gráficas Municipales, 1935. 118 pp.

Salas y Medina, J.—*Ensayos de crítica literaria*. México: Imp. Mundial, 1934. 142 pp.

Valle-Arizpe, A.—*Libro de estampas (Leyendas, tradiciones y sucedidos del México colonial)*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1934. 352 pp.

GENERAL

Armstrong, L. E.—*The phonetic structure of Somali*, reprinted from *Mitteilungen des Sem. für Orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin*. Berlin, 1934. 47 pp.

Bianquis, G.—*Faust à travers les âges*. Paris: Droz, 1934. 360 pp. Fr. 24.

Egilsrud, J. S.—"Le Dialogue des Morts" dans les littératures française, allemande et anglaise. Paris: Edit. Véga, 1935. 224 pp. Fr. 25.

Ringenson, K.—*Le Rapport d'ordinaux et de cardinaux dans les expressions de la date dans les langues romanes*. Paris: Droz, 1934. 131 pp.

035
tas
034.
r.—
392-
igel
ofé,
los
s y
ról.
id:
i +
obre
ed.
034.
uan
035.
Ed.
035.
esfa
32).
cos,
ica-
adas
les,
220
to].
enta
nici-
tica
034.
pas.
del
alpe,
ture
des
erlin.
iges.
rts"
e et
pp.
x et
date
Droz,



1935 TEXTS IN ENGLISH

ENGLISH POETRY OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Edited by CECIL A. MOORE, *University of Minnesota*

A companion volume to Moore's ENGLISH PROSE OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. The selections are excellent. The poets included are the most important of the period, and the poems chosen are at once standard, interesting and characteristic of the age. Of especial value are the introductions to the individual poets, which are terse and vivid biographic sketches, and which together form a simple and elucidating study of eighteenth-century poetry.

Ready in May

IDEAS AND MODELS

FOR ENGLISH COMPOSITION

Edited by

LOUISE POUND, L. C. WIMBERLY,

J. P. CALLAHAN, ROBERT A. LAW,

THEODORE STENBERG AND NORMAN ELIASON

An abundant collection of apt and stimulating materials, intended to give the Freshman ideas and models for the study of English composition. The selections, 135 in number and all by distinguished writers, pertain to all types of writing studied in elementary courses in composition. A simple and informative Handbook follows the selections. The book will undoubtedly become a popular text.

Ready in April

TOPICS FOR FRESHMAN WRITING

By JOHN CROWE RANSOM, *Vanderbilt University*

In this book Professor Ransom, an experienced teacher and eminent writer, has presented a novel, practical and highly stimulating text in English Composition. It contains twenty topic assignments, each designed not only to further the Freshman's facility in writing English but also to stimulate him in expressing himself on matters of interest to him. Each assignment is provided with several models and with a succinct discussion by the author. There is a brief but excellent Handbook at the back of the book.

Ready in June

AN ANGLO-SAXON READER

By JAMES W. BRIGHT,

Revised by JAMES R. HULBERT, *University of Chicago*

The revised edition of this standard text is improved by a simplification of the grammatical discussion, by a new and interesting sketch of Anglo-Saxon literature, and by some new reading matter.

\$2.75

A STUDY OF THE SHORT STORY

By HENRY SEIDEL CANBY,

Revised in Collaboration with ALFRED S. DASHIELL

Dr. Canby's Introduction, in many ways still the best of its kind, has been brought up to date not only in minor details but also by the addition of a new section on the short story since 1914. Outstanding stories by Harte, O. Henry, Anderson, Mansfield, Hemingway, Faulkner and Fitzgerald have been added for purposes of illustration. Both authors are editors of leading periodicals, and the new edition is certain to be one of the best texts in the field.

Ready in May

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

ONE PARK AVENUE

NEW YORK

For Modern Language Teachers

OLIVER'S

THE MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHER'S HANDBOOK

A *vade mecum* of suggestions, references, and information for all teachers of modern languages. (April, 1935)

• • •

BOVÉE AND CARNAHAN'S

NEW FRENCH REVIEW GRAMMAR AND COMPOSITION BOOK

Lessons based on a novel and highly interesting type of reading content. Abundant exercise material. Emphasis on idiom study. (May, 1935)

LEOPOLD'S

REISE DURCH DEUTSCHLAND: A Cultural First Reader

An introduction to German *Kultatkunde* in letter form. For intermediate college or elementary high-school work. (*In the Heath Chicago Language Series.*) (March, 1935)

PITTARO AND GREEN'S

VEINTE CUENTOS DIVERTIDOS

A section from the authors' *Progressive Spanish* containing short stories by Spanish and Spanish-American authors, retold in simplified form. (May, 1935)

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta San Francisco Dallas London

Old English Handbook

by MARJORIE ANDERSON and BLANCHE C. WILLIAMS

In this new book the authors have tried to make the presentation of Old English to beginning students as sound and effective pedagogically as that of any other subject in the curriculum. The GRAMMAR pursues a middle course between elementary and very scholarly treatises. Preceding inflection there is an adequate discussion of phonological modifications, such as breaking and palatalization, with lists of words and necessary paradigms for all parts of speech. Among the new features is a chapter on phonetics, with many illustrations of sound changes that occurred between Old English and Modern English. In the READER, selections are arranged from 1000 A. D. to 700 A. D. to fit as nearly as possible the student's progress from easier passages to those more difficult. There is an ample amount of material to meet the needs of the undergraduate or the prospective graduate student.

Miss Anderson is Assistant Professor of English, and Miss Williams, Head of the Department of English, Hunter College.

On press.

Houghton Mifflin Company

Boston New York Chicago Dallas Atlanta San Francisco